The United Methodist Mission in Higher Education

Retrospect and Prospects

The United Methodist Mission in Higher Education

Retrospect and Prospects

Louisburg College

Louisburg, North Carolina

1989

Copyright 1989 by Louisburg College.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America
by Graphic Labs, Louisburg, N. C.

Support for the seminar and for this publication
was provided by the Division of Higher Education,
Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the
United Methodist Church

Compiled and Designed by George-Anne Willard

Opposite Page: Seminar Presenters (left to right): Sidney Stafford, J. Allen Norris, Jr., Steven E. Brooks, George-Anne Willard, Mac L. Ricketts, F. Belton Joyner, Jr., Walter N. McDonald.

Cover Illustration: Louisburg College Main Building as pictured in the earliest known drawing (1861); the building was constructed for Louisburg Female College which opened in 1857.

CONTENTS

Foreword
J. Allen Norris, Jr. iv

The Origins of Methodist Support for Higher Education
Mac Linscott Ricketts 1

Evolution of the Methodist Link with Louisburg College
George-Anne Willard 19

Access to Higher Education in a Changing Society
Steven E. Brooks 27

Current Challenges to the Continuation of the United Methodist Mission in Higher Education
F. Belton Joyner, Jr. 41

Commentary
Walter N. McDonald 51

FOREWORD

During the 1986-1987 school year, Louisburg College celebrated its Bicentennial. As the oldest existing college (1787) now affiliated with the United Methodist Church, our attention to this part of our heritage is important to us; it is essential that we understand and appreciate the link between United Methodism and higher education. We know that our identity as a church-related college will become even more important as the years proceed.

On September 22, 1988, a seminar was held at Louisburg College on "The United Methodist Mission in Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospects," the purpose of which was to increase knowledge and understanding of the historic link between United Methodism and American higher education and of the challenges facing the continuation of opportunity for choice in higher education.

The seminar was made possible by a grant from the Division of Higher Education of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist Church. Attending the seminar were Louisburg College faculty and staff, members of the Louisburg College Board of Trustees and Board of Visitors, members of the North Carolina Conference Board of Higher Education, representatives of other United Methodist colleges, and a number of ministers and lay leaders.

The seminar concluded with a panel and audience discussion, which was moderated by the Reverend Sidney Stafford, Professor of Religion and Philosophy and Louisburg College Chaplain. Commentary was provided by the Reverend Walter N. McDonald, Louisburg College Professor of Religion and Education, Emeritus.

This publication contains the text of the papers presented at the seminar. In the first presentation, by Mac L. Ricketts, we look at the beginnings of United Methodist involvement in higher education (especially Cokesbury). Dr. Ricketts is Louisburg College Professor of Religion and author of *Mircea Eliade: The Romanian Roots, 1907-1945.*

In the second paper, by George-Anne Willard, we see how Louisburg College came into basic nurture by Methodists. Although the college was not owned by Methodists until the early twentieth century, Louisburg College from the very beginning had been nurtured by the Methodist tradition and by people who called themselves Methodist. Dr. Willard served as the seminar coordinator; she is Louisburg College Professor of History and author of *Louisburg College Echoes: Voices from the Formative Years, 1787-1917.*

The third presentation, by Steven E. Brooks, examines the issue of access. It has been the Methodist tradition to provide education to those who have thought it beyond their reach. In light of that tradition, it is absolutely essential that we concentrate on protecting that access in enabling our people to have the opportunity to go to college. Dr. Brooks is Louisburg College Dean of Academic Services and author of *NASFFA--The First Twenty Years.*

The fourth presentation, by F. Belton Joyner, Jr., provides a vision of where United Methodist higher education will go in the future and what it is going to take to get there. Dr. Joyner serves as Executive Director of the Council on Ministries of the North Carolina Conference of the United Methodist Church and has authored numerous articles and materials for the United Methodist Church. Each one of the challenges cited by his paper needs to be studied, and we need to ask: are we doing what we need to do in order to answer those challenges? The future is going to be bright because we keep on *trying* to answer those challenges; it is when we stop trying that the future becomes bleak.

The United Methodist presence in higher education is a *vital* presence, and we are the better because our church cares.

J. Allen Norris, Jr.
President of Louisburg College
Louisburg, North Carolina

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/unitedmethodistmwill

The Origins of Methodist Support for Higher Education

by Mac Linscott Ricketts

Part I

The United Methodist Church today has under its supervision more colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education than any other Protestant denomination in the United States. According to a list published last year, the United Methodist Church is officially "related" to ninety senior colleges and universities, twelve junior colleges, thirteen theological seminaries, and two other graduate professional schools, for a total of 117 institutions of higher education.[1] Roman Catholics in the United States, with a membership about six times that of the United Methodist Church, support only about twice that number (232) of colleges and universities. Southern Baptists, some sixty percent more numerous than Methodists, are related to only 53 colleges and universities, 6 seminaries, and several secondary-level schools. No other denomination approaches the number of institutions of higher education affiliated with the United Methodist Church.[2]

But when we look back at Methodism's involvement in higher education in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the sight is simply amazing. Exact figures seem impossible to ascertain, but when all the colleges, junior colleges, and secondary schools ever founded or owned by some segment of the churches that now comprise the United Methodist Church are added to those privately owned but "operated in the interest of" the Methodist Church, the total is over one thousand -- possibly as high as twelve hundred.[3]

Granted that between 1820 and 1920, the Methodists were the most numerous Protestant communion in the United States, this is still a remarkable figure--and especially so when we realize that Methodists entered the field of higher education *in earnest* relatively late: the first successful (i.e., lasting more than a few years) Methodist College--Randolph Macon--was founded only in 1830. By this time the Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and above all the Presbyterians had planted colleges in virtually all the states, and in several places the Presbyterians also controlled the state colleges and universities, exerting a virtual monopoly on higher education in those areas.[4] Once Methodists became seriously involved in higher education, they quickly made themselves leaders in that endeavor. The period 1830-1860 saw a large number of collegiate and semi-collegiate classical or "literary" institutions founded by Methodists, not only in the newer states, but also in the older

ones. Other denominations were busily starting new colleges in these decades as well, but none kept pace with the Methodists.

At the close of the Civil War, the Methodist Episcopal Church (the northern church--after the separation of 1844-45) was in the vanguard of northern churches that rushed into the South to establish schools of all sorts, including colleges, for former slaves, under its "Freedman's Aid Society." Many of those institutions have long since fallen by the wayside, having served their purpose, but the Church still watches over eight colleges, one medical school, and one theological seminary attended primarily by black students--most of which were founded by the Freedman's Aid Society.

Elsewhere in the country, in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, a new liberal spirit increasingly overtook higher education, with the result that true universities, inspired somewhat by the German model, appeared for the first time (Johns Hopkins, Cornell, Harvard, Chicago, etc.) At this time, several Methodist colleges rose to the status of universities (Boston, Syracuse, Northwestern) and one university--Vanderbilt, pride of Southern Methodism--was founded as such. New liberal arts colleges were started and older ones strengthened, while theological education, barely begun before the Civil War, was put on a firm foundation.

In the twentieth century Methodists continued to create new colleges in the United States down into the sixties. All the while, from the late nineteenth century on, schools and colleges were being launched under Methodist auspices in foreign lands, as adjuncts of missionary activity. This activity has not yet ceased: the most recent General Conference of the Methodist Church (1988) voted to found a Methodist college in Zimbabwe--the first for the church on African soil.

The Beginnings

Although the first "permanent" Methodist college dates only from 1830, American Methodists made their first venture in higher education much earlier. At the historic Baltimore Christmas Conference of December 24, 1784-January 2, 1785[5] at which the Methodist Episcopal Church was officially constituted, one of the questions asked was, "But what must we do for the *Rising* Generation?" The answer given was, "Preach expressly on Education."[6] But the sixty preachers did more than vow to preach: although not one of them was a college graduate,[7] they voted to establish a college--to be located in nearby Abingdon, Maryland. The name they chose for it, Cokesbury College, was coined from the surnames of the infant church's two bishops, Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury.[8]

It was fitting that the college should bear the bishops' names, since both had wanted to create a Methodist school in America. Asbury, who had lived in North

America since 1771, had been planning a school since at least 1780. In that year he and John Dickins, another Methodist preacher and almost the only one in America with any college education (he had studied at Eton), had discussed the possibility of starting a school under Methodist auspices.[9] The idea, in fact, seems to have originated with Dickins, whose thought was to locate the school in North Carolina, where he was currently serving a circuit (on the Roanoke River; he and Asbury had their talk in Halifax County). He even began raising funds for it.[10] The kind of school they had in mind was one along the lines of Kingswood School, which John Wesley had opened in Bristol, England, in 1748.[11]

Kingswood School, on which Wesley expended much money and energy over much of his life, admitted boys aged 6-12. The pupils were arranged in eight classes (grades) with four more optional above these. They were taught the three Rs, French, Latin, Greek, Hebrew (the standard fare in American "literary" academies and colleges also, prior to the Civil War), history, geography, logic, ethics, geometry, algebra, physics, and music. Applicants were carefully screened and, after admittance, were subject to strict discipline. Play was expressly forbidden. Wesley himself wrote many of the textbooks, usually by abridging the works of others. He did not hesitate to edit the classics also, purging them of anything "immodest or profane." He once boasted that "whoever carefully goes through this course will be a better scholar than 9 in 10 graduates of Oxford or Cambridge."[12]

When Coke arrived in the United States in late 1784--his first visit to the former colonies, having been sent by Wesley to launch the American Methodist Church--he and Asbury, at their first meeting, discussed the founding of an educational institution. Coke, who held a Doctor of Civil Law degree from Jesus College, Oxford, and was one of the most highly educated men in Methodism, wanted a college. Asbury, who had dropped out of school at age 13, favored a less advanced institution.[13] At the Conference, Coke's preference prevailed, in name at least (though in fact, Cokesbury was little more than an elementary school and academy, admitting boys at age seven and trying to keep them until graduation).[14]

Once the Conference had endorsed Coke's plan (in which Asbury generously acquiesced), he lost no time in launching the project. Three days after the close of the conference, he was ordering building materials (he and Asbury had come to the conference with about $5,000 already in hand for a school). A beautiful six-acre site overlooking Chesapeake Bay was procured.[15] The cornerstone was laid on June 5, 1785, with Asbury preaching. 108 feet in length and 40 in width, the handsome brick structure was three full stories high, topped by an attic. Classes probably commenced in late summer of 1787, and the formal dedication took place on December 6 of the same year. Apparently only two or three rooms were finished at this time; it was not until 1789 that the whole building was completed inside. The college, including furnishings, cost over $50,000--a tremendous sum for the times and for the small church: 15,000 members in 1784--people of quite modest means, for the most

part. (For comparison, consider that the first president of the school was paid an annual salary of $300 plus room and board for himself and his family of three.)[16]

Cokesbury College was to be supported principally by an annual assessment on all the churches and by a modest tuition charged to those students whose parents could afford to pay it. Nevertheless, the school was over $8,000 in debt two years after opening. It fell to Asbury as the only resident bishop (Coke traveled all over the world for Wesley and spent short visits only in the United States) to superintend the college and raise funds for it (the total costs for the ten-year life of the project have been estimated at between $75,000 and $100,000).[17]

In December, 1795, eight years after it had opened, Cokesbury College burned to the ground. Arson was presumed, but no arsonist was ever apprehended. When Asbury, in South Carolina, received the news, he wrote in his journal: "It's [Cokesbury's] enemies may rejoice, and its friends need not mourn. If any man should give me £10,000 per year to do and suffer again what I have done for that house, I would not do it. The Lord called not...the Methodists to build colleges. I wished only for schools--Dr. Coke wanted a college. I feel distressed at the loss of the library."[18] Asbury's seemingly bitter comments should not be taken as indicative of his whole attitude toward the school, since on another occasion he wrote much more favorably--almost enthusiastically--about it.[19] In the opinion of Methodist historian and bishop, John O. Gross: "This first Methodist college in the world had no more loyal or devoted friend than Mr. Asbury."[20]

The ashes of Cokesbury College were scarcely cold before seventeen men of Baltimore, friends of Bishop Coke, assembled and pledged about $4,500 for the rebuilding of the school. As it turned out, however, they found available a suitable structure, a defunct dance hall (built by an opponent of Methodism to annoy worshippers in a nearby church) in the city of Baltimore. They purchased it and refitted it as a second Cokesbury--though this time it was frankly conducted as an academy. The new school was open to both sexes and enrollment was higher than it had ever been at Abingdon (now about 200), but before the end of the year (1796) fire struck again, and the building was destroyed.[21] Neither the bishops nor the Conference attempted to rebuild or relocate the school this time. Instead, Asbury devoted his efforts in the area of education to the promotion of several local schools of the academy type.

Why a College So Soon?

One may well ask, why did the infant Methodist Church attempt to found a college at this time? In 1785 there existed nine strong colleges that had been established in the colonial period and were operated by the older denominations.[22] Several other colleges had been founded by Episcopalians and Presbyterians

between 1782 and 1785, including two in Maryland (Washington at Charlestown in 1782, and St. John's at Annapolis, 1784).[23] Many others were planned. Moreover, given the humble economic and social status of most Methodists of the time, one wonders how many young men of the church would have been interested in obtaining a classical education, even if they could have afforded it.

Nearly all the colleges founded in the colonial era were established primarily for the education of ministers.[24] Prior to 1750, fully half the graduates of colonial colleges became clergy.[25] Not that the colleges were professional theological schools--those did not appear until the nineteenth century--but it was traditional that the clergy should be the best educated class in society. The curriculum was classical, with heavy stress on Greek, Latin, metaphysics, ethics, mathematics, etc., to which the Biblical languages of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac were added in America.[26] It is not surprising that the majority of college and preparatory school faculty were clergymen. Ministers were the educational elite of colonial America.

Methodist clergy, in contrast to those of most other denominations, were not, by and large, educated men.[27] Wesley had recruited them to be *preachers*, bearers of a message: *prophets*, not priests (since Methodists were supposed to constitute "societies" within the Church of England, not be a separate church). When Methodism became a church in America, therefore, its leadership consisted of men with little formal education. None of them, in fact, including Asbury, had even be ordained before the coming of Coke in 1784.[28]

Wesley's attitude toward higher education for his ministers was somewhat ambiguous. Though a university graduate (M.A.) and a brilliant, lifelong scholar, he deemed a formal (i.e. classical) education unnecessary for his preachers. He insisted that they know the Bible, and he imposed upon them a discipline of the daily reading of books, but for him piety was the essential thing. When an Anglican bishop refused to ordain one of Wesley's preachers for service in America because he was unversed in Latin and Greek, Wesley wrote him: "...My Lord, I do by no means despise learning: I Know the value of it all too well. But what is this, particularly, in a Christian minister, compared to piety? What is this in a man who has no religion? 'As a jewel in a swine's snout.'"[29]

In view of the fact that almost none of the ministers of the newly-created church had ever attended a college and none was a college graduate, it might be supposed that Cokesbury College was founded to help remedy their educational deficiencies. This was not so. The Methodist traveling preachers of the new nation apparently did not consider that their "educational deficiencies" constituted a handicap for the evangelistic work among rude frontiersmen in which they were for the most part engaged.[30] It would be several decades before the low educational level of their clergy would begin to be an embarrassment to American Methodists, and an even longer time before concrete steps were taken to remedy the problem.[31]

Unlike the colleges previously established by other denominations, the first Methodist college was not founded primarily for the education of the clergy. In the document called "Plan of Education Established in Cokesbury College," published in the *Discipline* of 1789, the three categories of young men for whom the institution is intended are listed as: "the sons of the elders and preachers of the Methodist Church, poor orphans, and the sons of the subscribers and of other friends." Almost as an afterthought it is stated: "The institution also is intended for the benefit of our young men who are called to preach, that they may receive a measure of that improvement which is highly expedient as a preparation for public service."[32]

The category of pupils on whom the most emphasis is placed in the official statement as it continues is the first, the sons of the traveling preachers. In the Methodist system, ministers were expected to travel circuits in sparsely settled regions, and under such conditions they would be absent from home for long periods of time. Most traveling preachers were unmarried; if they took wives, they usually "located"; that is, they withdrew from the itinerant ministry (and conference membership) and became "local preachers" without appointment. Cokesbury College was established, it seems, to alleviate the situation of married traveling ministers whose wives were finding it difficult to rear their sons in the absence of their husbands on church duty. The statement suggests that "preachers' kids" were becoming already a discipline problem: "One considerable difficulty lies on those that have boys, when they grow too big to be under their mother's direction. Having no father to govern and instruct them, they are exposed to a thousand temptations. To remedy this is one motive that induces us to lay before our friends the intent of the college, that these little ones may have all the instruction they are capable of, together with all things necessary for the body.[33] Cokesbury College, thus, was to stand *in loco pater*, to serve as a surrogate father, for the growing sons of Conference preachers.

Furthermore, as the statement makes explicit later, sons of ministers are to be housed, fed, clothed, and taught *gratis* at the school, except in the (unlikely) case that the parents are able to pay. The same privileges are extended to the "poor orphans" admitted. Thus, the ministers' sons are *treated like poor orphans*, charity cases, and the college is styled more than once in the statement as "one of the noblest charities that can be conceived." The "Plan" provides that sons of subscribers, or boys recommended by subscribers who have no sons of their own, will be given priority in admission--after ministers' sons (thus, ahead of orphans). Subscribers would have been, presumably, relatively well-to-do lay members and constituents of the church. A modest tuition was charged to such persons whose sons were admitted.

Discipline at Cokesbury, as might be expected, was described as strict. As at Kingswood, there was to be "nothing that the world calls *play*...for those who play

when they are young will play when they are old." Recreation was to consist of vegetable gardening (for which a three-acre plot was set aside), walking, riding, bathing (but not in the river!), and woodworking (in a shop adjoining the school). As was customary in all schools of that time, and for most of the nineteenth century as well, two times of "prayer" (devotions) were observed daily, at 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. A schedule of activities covered every hour of the day. Students who repeatedly broke the rules or who had "a total incapacity to attain learning" were to be expelled. The bishops were to examine the pupils from time to time--a duty which usually devolved upon Asbury.[34]

The college advertised itself as "a place where learning and religion may go hand in hand" and where the children would be protected from "those temptations to which they are too much exposed in most public schools." The goal of the college, as set forth in the first sentence of the Plan, is identical to that of the church: "the advance of religion in America." The point is elaborated further on: "...our first object shall be to answer the design of *Christian* education, by forming the minds of the youth, through divine aid, to wisdom and holiness, by instilling into their tender minds the principles of true religion, speculative, experimental, and practical, and training them in the ancient way, that they may be rational, Scriptural Christians."[35] The phraseology, of course, is typically Wesleyan.

However, the school also aimed to give pupils an education in secular subjects: "And though our principal object is to instruct them in the doctrines, spirit, and practice of Christianity, yet we trust that our college will in time send forth men that will be a blessing to their country in every laudable office and employment of life, thereby uniting the two greatest ornaments of intelligent beings, which are too often separated: *deep learning* and *genuine religion*."[36]

There is more than a hint here, I believe, of a fear of education, that it may lead away from genuine religion and piety. Cokesbury College, it should be remembered, arose at a moment in American history when religion was under attack from intellectuals: Tom Paine's *Age of Reason* and Ethan Allen's *Reason, the Only Oracle of Man* (both anti-Christian books) were published in 1784, the year of the Christmas Conference. Skepticism, Deism, atheism, and numerous forms of immorality were rife in the older, established colleges (Harvard, Yale, Princeton, William and Mary, etc.), despite their having been founded as religious institutions. It was a rare student at any of these colleges in that era who would admit to being a Christian; French revolutionary ideas were in vogue with the young intellectuals.[37] Efforts were made by men of liberal views (such as Thomas Jefferson) to remove the colleges from church control and place them under the administration of secularized state governments.[38]

Early in the nineteenth century the tide would turn against this liberalism with the "Second Great Awakening," and churches would once more resume their favored

place at the helm of education. This period, lasting at least until the Civil War, would see the establishment of literally hundreds of denominational colleges all across the expanding nation.[39] But in the 1780s this age of the church college could not be foreseen. The Methodists, one of the smallest and least influential religious communities in America at that time, nevertheless had the daring and vision to found an institution of higher education in which the old ideal of a union of piety and knowledge would prevail.

Cokesbury College in Operation

The Plan sets forth Cokesbury College's ideals. But how did these work out in practice?

Because of the two fires that destroyed the college's records, we know very little about the functioning and accomplishments of the institution. On the strong recommendation of John Wesley, an Anglican clergyman, the Reverend Levi Heath, was named the first president of Cokesbury.[40] When Coke offered him the post, he was headmaster of a grammar school and curate at Kidderminster, England. He resigned those positions and, after some delay, sailed with his wife and two young daughters for America, arriving, probably, in late September, 1787. Besides Heath, the faculty consisted of two other men: Truman Marsh, age 19, a new graduate of Yale College, said to have been a Quaker, and Patrick McCloskey, whom Coke had recruited in Ireland and who, according to one source, was a Catholic.[41] Thus, the first faculty of Methodism's first college was both international and ecumenical. All three men, however, had departed Cokesbury before a year had passed. Details are hard to ascertain, but Marsh seems to have resigned first, and the following year was ordained an Episcopalian priest. McCloskey left to devote himself to farming. According to Asbury, both teachers had quit the school by August 10, 1788. Soon afterward, for reasons that are disputed, Heath too resigned.[42]

Dr. Jacob Hall, a resident of Abingdon, became the second president and remained at the head of the college until it burned in 1795. (I did not learn his denominational affiliation.) At least two Methodist preachers are known to have taught in the school: one, the chaplain, was said to have been "the roughest-spoken preacher that ever stood in the itinerant ranks." Another teacher, John Hargrove, later became a Swedenborgian and founded the first Church of the New Jerusalem congregation in Baltimore.[43] It is not known if any youth ever received a baccalaureate degree from Cokesbury College.

Concerning enrollment at Cokesbury, Dr. John O. Gross, who made an extensive study of the school's history, says, "In the nine [sic!] years of the existence of Cokesbury College at Abingdon, Maryland, it is doubtful if the enrollment in the aggregate exceeded 400 students....We surmise that a total of not more than 200

young men were even enrolled at Cokesbury." The largest number attending at one time was seventy in 1792.[44] Yet out of these few it is known that there came two United States senators, and a third man, son of John Dickins, served as secretary to the Senate for twenty-five years. Another alumnus, Valentine Cook, whom Gross calls "probably the most learned man of the Methodist ministry in his day," enjoyed a distinguished career as preacher and educator. Another became one of the founders of Wesleyan University in Connecticut.[45]

One can only speculate on what Cokesbury College might have become had its original building not burned. Perhaps it would have remained a small, undistinguished school, more academy than college, for a few decades, and then faded away--as happened, in fact, with many institutions founded by Methodists and others over the next half-century and more.[46] Or perhaps it would have flourished and served to raise the intellectual and cultural tone of early American Methodism, even altering the course of the church's history.

Cokesbury College, almost certainly, was born prematurely; the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1785-1796 was not yet ready to support a college. And yet there were a few men of vision, both ministers and laymen, who believed sufficiently in the cause of "higher education" to make tremendous sacrifices of money and energy in order to provide a facility for the training of Methodist youth in the first decade of the church's existence.

Part II

Asbury's Other Schools

Cokesbury College was by no means the only school with which Asbury and the early American Methodists were associated. Although none of them long survived, their memory testifies to Asbury's generation's concern with the education of its youth.

The first school founded by Asbury was in operation even at the time of the Christmas Conference of 1784 and thus is the earliest Methodist school in America. Called Ebenezer Academy, it was erected between 1780 and 1784 at a rural site in Brunswick County, Virginia, across the state line from Halifax County, North Carolina. Asbury makes only vague references to it in his journal. It seems to have ceased to operate as a Methodist institution soon after 1800, but while it existed it was, like Cokesbury College, under the direct supervision of the bishops.[47]

In 1791 Asbury sent out an open letter to all the Methodist societies calling upon them to organize district schools to be operated on the same general principles as Cokesbury College.[48] The first to be so organized was situated in North Carolina

on the Yadkin River near the present town of Advance, southwest of Winston-Salem. Named after the college in Abingdon, the academy was called Cokesbury School. Its organizers, a Methodist preacher and a Methodist farmer, seem to have put the school into operation in 1793. A boy of about 12, Patrick McClaskey, who formerly had attended Cokesbury College, is known to have attended Cokesbury School in 1793-94. The school probably was in operation for only two or three years.[49]

In 1789 a delegation of Methodists from Kentucky met with Bishops Asbury and Coke when they were holding a conference in western North Carolina (near the site of the later Cokesbury School) and requested their aid in establishing a college in their area. Asbury went to Kentucky in 1790 and held a conference at a place a little south of Lexington. Plans were laid at that time for a school to be located nearby with the name of Bethel Academy. It was built soon afterwards in a remote wilderness area on a bluff overlooking the Kentucky River. Due to the extremely isolated location and to financial difficulties, it ceased to function by 1800 or a little later.[50]

More successful and enduring was a school organized in a Methodist church in Uniontown, southwestern Pennsylvania, in 1792. Originally called Union School, it was later styled Union Seminary. In 1826 the Pittsburgh Conference upgraded it to a college with the name of Madison. But in 1832, having acquired a former Presbyterian school, Allegheny College at Meadville, Pennsylvania, the Conference withdrew its support from Madison College.[51]

Asbury worked for several years, beginning in 1793, to establish the Mt. Bethel Academy in Newberry, South Carolina. It may have opened as early as 1795 or as late as 1802. Mt. Bethel enjoyed a brilliant, if brief, career furnishing many students to the state college of South Carolina which opened in 1805. It ceased operation in 1820 when its head left to become president of South Carolina College.[52]

After Asbury

Asbury died in 1816, and in that same year or shortly thereafter a college bearing his name was opened by the Methodists of Baltimore. Asbury College of Baltimore has the distinction of being the first Methodist College to have been officially chartered (Cokesbury was not). The college flourished for about a decade, but it ceased operations in 1828 when its president was expelled from the church during a doctrinal controversy.[53]

A distinguished Methodist school in New England bearing the name of the Wesleyan Academy had its origins in 1815-17. The original impetus came from the Methodist ministers in Newmarket, New Hampshire (near Portsmouth), who succeeded in getting approval for their plan for an academy from the New England

Conference in 1816. It opened in 1817 as a co-educational school--something of a novelty for the time and place. In 1824 it was relocated in Wilbraham, Massachusetts (near Springfield) where, under excellent leadership, it became a relatively large and influential educational institution. It continued to exist until long after the Civil War.[54]

In 1819 the New York Conference established a school called Wesleyan Seminary in the city of New York.[55] Supporters of the Newmarket Academy and the Wesleyan Seminary approached the General Conference of 1820 with the proposal that the bishops be authorized to appoint ministers to posts at academies and colleges for more than two successive years, which then was the limit for all appointments. Although there was opposition, the Conference approved the request and went on to make further statements concerning higher education--a subject neglected since the demise of Cokesbury College. Noting that nearly all the prominent "seminaries of learning" in the country were under the control of either Calvinistic or "Hopkinsian" principles, and that in most of them "experimental and practical godliness is considered only of secondary importance whereas...this ought to form the most prominent feature in every literary institution," the Conference voted to "recommend to all annual conferences to establish, as soon as practicable, literary institutions under their own control."[56] This resolution, reiterated at the next General Conference (1824), was the signal for the beginning of a more concerted effort in higher education among Methodists. There was still much opposition and not a little apathy to be overcome, but the beginning had been made. During that decade, numerous strong academies were established by various conferences, and one genuine college was founded (in addition to Madison College mentioned above).[57]

In 1821 the Kentucky and Ohio Conferences pooled their resources to create Augusta College at Augusta, Kentucky, on the Ohio River. A charter permitting the school to confer degrees was granted the next year--making this the second Methodist institution to have been so authorized.[58] The first A.B.s were graduated in 1829; when the college lost its charter and closed in 1849 (in the wake of the split of the Methodist Episcopal Church north and south), there had been a total of 153 graduates.[59]

In 1828 the General Conference considered the possibility of establishing a single, major university for the Methodist Church, but in the end rejected the idea. Pointing out that less than half the annual conferences had even good academies, it stated that for the good of religion, government, and society, the church ought to "make provision for the common instruction of the *many*" before establishing a university for the *few*.[60] This action illustrates the view that has prevailed throughout the Methodist Church's history in America: the concern for providing for a broad education for as large a number as possible, rather than the promotion of elitist schools for a minority of specially-favored young people.

The first "permanent" Methodist colleges--those still existing today--did not take their rise until 1830-31 when Randolph-Macon College was founded in Virginia by the Methodists of Virginia and North Carolina (then comprising one conference), and those of New York and New England founded Wesleyan College (later University) at Middletown, Connecticut. A college was first discussed by the Virginia Conference in 1825, but the school was not chartered until early 1830 and did not open until two years later. Its first location was near the Virginia-North Carolina border at Boydton. It was moved to a more accessible location, Ashland (north of Richmond), in 1868.[61]

Wesleyan College was established by a vote of the New York and New England Conferences in 1829 when the buildings of a former private military academy in Middletown, Connecticut became available to them. A preparatory school was opened in October, 1830 and the college in September, 1831, shortly after a charter had been received from the state. Located in a region of the country noted for high educational standards and led by one of Methodism's most able educators, Wilbur Fisk, Wesleyan College soon became a strong and respected institution. It separated from the Methodist Church toward the end of the nineteenth century.[62]

The Rush to Found Colleges

After 1830-31, up to the outbreak of the Civil War, colleges sponsored by the various conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South sprang up like mushrooms after a rain. Some 34 colleges established under Methodist auspices between 1830 and 1860 were still in operation a century later, and all but three or four of them are still functioning as Methodist colleges today.[63] Many others were started but did not survive or else ceased to be Methodist institutions.[64] Noteworthy in this era was the founding of Wesleyan Female College in Macon, Georgia: the first chartered, degree-granting women's college in America. Established non-denominationally under another name in 1836, it was taken over by the Methodists of Georgia in 1839.[65] Numerous other "female colleges" and seminaries soon followed under Methodist and other denominational auspices.

Why did the Methodist Church become so enthusiastic for establishing institutions of higher education in this antebellum era? Frederick Rudolph, an historian of American higher education who is rather critical of the whole church college effort, links Methodism's sudden enthusiasm for colleges at this time to the denomination's desire for middle-class respectability: "For the Methodists and Baptists, founding colleges became a part of that apparently endless American process of coming to terms with an essentially middle-class society....Baptists and Methodists discovered that they were at least candidates for rank in the middle reaches of society. With that discovery went the necessity of erecting colleges, institutions which not only catered to some of the requirements of middle-class life,

but which also helped to lend an aura of respectability to Methodists and Baptists as they worked their way from poverty to plenty.[66]

Albea Godbold, a more sympathetic student of the Protestant church colleges of the Old South, finds ten reasons why Southern churches wanted to establish colleges in this era. All or nearly all of these motives are applicable to the Methodists, and not only to those living in the South.

1. For the education of ministers. As we have seen, this was *not* a primary motivation for Methodists until relatively late. It *had* become a factor by the 1830s for many church leaders.

2. The belief that education is a function of religion, that the two are closely linked. Many church people were unwilling to entrust the education of their children to "secular" institutions--even though these were often heavily dominated by religious trustees and administrations.

3. To lower the cost of higher education and put it within the reach of the common man. In contrast to the present situation, tuition at state colleges in the early nineteenth century was higher than at denominational schools. Methodist colleges frequently emphasized their lower costs in their advertising.

4. A sense of obligation to make a contribution to the cultural life of the country; a patriotic duty.

5. To strengthen denominational loyalty among the rising generation, whose members might be drawn into other churches whose colleges they attended.

6. To extend the influence of the denomination in society, government, etc. through the graduates of the colleges.

7. To keep pace with other denominations which also were establishing more colleges.

8. For evangelistic purposes, since "revivals" were a regular feature of college life in almost all denominational institutions.

9. To promote sectional interests. In the South, at least, this was a major factor: to prevent the youth from going north to study where they might be turned against "southern institutions" (e.g., slavery).

10. A concomitant of increased membership. Methodists became, about 1820, the largest denomination in America.[67]

These were conscious, openly-expressed reasons for founding "literary institutions" in the antebellum era--and all are amply documented in the literature of the time. Unconsciously, no doubt, the desire for enhanced social status was also a motivating factor. But whether the motives were worthy, unworthy, or--as was mostly the case--mixed, Methodists expended large sums of money, and many men and women made real sacrifices that these colleges might come into being and continue to exist--for the sake of "the rising generation."

Notes

1. "Schools, Colleges, and Universities of the United Methodist Church, U.S.A.," leaflet published by the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, the U.M.C., Nashville, September, 1987.

2. *Time*, October 17, 1988, p. 62; *The Religious Herald* (Richmond), February 16, 1978.

3. Nolan B. Harmon, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, I (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), p. 749; Umphrey Lee, *For the Rising Generation* (Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1958), p. 19. The "Mission Statement of the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education (in *idem.*, *A College-Related Church*, Nashville: National Commission, 1976, p. 15) gives a total of 130 colleges founded by Methodists in the nineteenth century, but this is much too low a figure. For example, DuBose in 1916 could list 105 Methodist institutions, most of them called "colleges," located in the southern states only, which had ceased to function, and 57 colleges of the southern church then operating (many of which no longer exist today). See Horace M. DuBose, *A History of Methodism* (Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, 1916), pp. 575-77. Thirty years earlier, in 1886, Cummings listed 46 colleges of the M. E. Church (north) operating (plus six theological schools), and 141 colleges, academies, institutes, etc., established either by the church or on its behalf at some time prior to 1884--most of which were then defunct. See A. W. Cummings, *The Early Schools of Methodism* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1886), pp. 426-31.

4. These states were North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and Indiana. See Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War* (New York: Archon Books, 1965; rep. of 1932 original edition), p. 63. Other denominations preceding Methodists in establishing strong colleges: Dutch and German Reformed, Lutheran, Baptist, and Catholic.

5. This was by no means the first conference held by Methodist preachers in America. They had been meeting irregularly since June, 1773, when their first conference had been convened in Philadelphia. See W. H. Daniels, *The Illustrated History of Methodism* (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1879), p. 400.

6. U. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

7. Bishop Coke, just arrived from England, had a doctorate from Oxford.

8. The vote was taken on January 1. Among names suggested for the college were "The New Kingswood," "Coke College," and "Asbury College." Coke himself proposed the name selected. See John O. Gross, *Cokesbury College* (Nashville: Parthenon Press, n.d. [ca. 1948]), p. 14. John Wesley, when he heard the name was indignant and wrote a harsh, sarcastic letter, implying pride on the part of the bishops (whom he had designated only "general superintendents"). The Conference was attended by 60 of the 81 preachers belonging to the connection (Daniels, *op. cit.*, p. 495). The preachers, whose annual cash salary was a uniform $64.00, nevertheless pledged $5,000 toward the erection of the new college. (Paul Neff Garber, *The Romance of American Methodism* [Greensboro: Piedmont Press, 1931], p. 208.

9. John Dickins was the first head of the Book Concern, 1789-1797. John King was another traveling preacher who had attended Oxford without graduating. See John Fletcher Hurst, *The History of Methodism* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1903), vol. V, p. 926.

10. Albea Godbold, "Methodism and Higher Education in North Carolina, 1776-1976," in O. Kelly Ingram, ed., *Methodism Alive and Well* (Durham: Divinity School of Duke University, 1976), pp. 115-16; N. Fred Jordan, "Cokesbury School," in Ingram, *op. cit.*, p. 49. Dickins later sent his son to Cokesbury College.

11. Elmer T. Clark, ed., *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), I, pp. 324, 358.

12. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-15.

13. On Asbury and Coke see Daniels, *op. cit.*, pp. 410- 16, 470-73; and John A. Vickers, "Coke and Asbury: A Comparison of Bishops," in *Methodist History*, XI, 1, October, 1972, pp. 42-51.

14. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Asbury, in fact, often referred to it as an academy (Cummings, *op. cit.*, p. 32). See also Albea Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1944), p. 31.

15. Church-sponsored colleges (and others as well) customarily were situated in remote, rural locations to avoid the "temptations" and vices associated with more populated places. This principle guided the founders of many Methodist colleges throughout the nineteenth century.

16. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 10; Frank Baker, "John Wesley and Cokesbury College's First President," in *Methodist History*, XI, 2 (January 1973), p. 57.

17. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

18. Clark, ed., *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, vol. II, p. 75 (Jan. 5, 1796).

19. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Most of Asbury's journal entries about Cokesbury College are terse statements about administrative matters.

20. *Ibid.*

21. The fire occurred on December 6, 1796, started by boys playing in a neighboring building. A Methodist church also was lost in the blaze. Gross, *op. cit.*,p. 21, Cummings, *op. cit.*, p. 32; Daniels, *op. cit.*, pp. 512-13; Hurst, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 392.

22. Harvard (founded 1636); William and Mary (1693); Yale (1701); Princeton (College of New Jersey, 1746); Columbia (King's College, 1754); University of Pennsylvania (College of Philadelphia, 1755); Brown (1765); Rutgers (Queen's College, 1766); and Dartmouth (1769). The "Great Awakening" in the middle of the eighteenth century gave impetus to the founding of Brown (Baptist), Rutgers (Dutch Reformed), Princeton (Presbyterian), and Dartmouth (Congregational). See Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33, 58.

23. Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 34. These colleges still exist.

24. All except the College of Philadelphia (1755) in which Quakers were involved. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1976*, 3rd edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1958, 1968, 1976), p. 7.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

27. Methodist historian John Fletcher Hurst says that the earliest Methodist preachers were looked down upon by clergy of other denominations because of their lack of education, their itinerant system, and their varied worship services. Hurst, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 479 f.

28. Cf. Umphrey Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

29. Cited in Daniels, *op. cit.*, p. 359. Cf. also this quotation from Wesley's journal (for 1760): "Our church requires that clergymen should be men of learning and to this end have a university education. But how many have a university education and yet no learning at all? Meantime, one of eminent learning, as well as unblamable behavior, cannot be ordained, 'because he was not at the University!' What a mere farce is this! Who would believe that any Christian bishop would stoop to so poor an evasion?" (Cited in Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* [New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970], pp. 257-58.)

30. The *Discipline* of 1784 includes this statement: "Gaining knowledge is a good thing, but saving souls is better" (cited in Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 103). This attitude predominated for more than a generation among American Methodist clergy.

31. After having made no mention of higher education since 1796, the General Conference of 1816 deplored the lack of education among its ministers, declared it the ministers' duty to gain knowledge, and directed the bishops to prepare for the young ministers a "course of study" (i.e., a list of books that each man must read). (It was the next General Conference, that of 1820, that urged all annual conferences to establish "literary institutions." See Godbold, "Methodism and Higher Education in North Carolina," p. 116.)

Discussion about starting a theological seminary began in 1833 among some preachers in New England, but there was little interest in it on the part of the church in general. The first Methodist theological training began at Newbury, Vermont, as an adjunct of an academy, in the early 1840s; this

led to the founding of a separate theological school at Concord, New Hampshire, in 1847. Twenty years later it moved to Boston and became part of Boston University. (Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 369-78.)

The Methodist Episcopal Church South was even slower in inaugurating theological education. In 1858 the General Conference of the M.E.C.S. recommended to all its colleges the establishment of chairs of Biblical Literature, but specified that it was *not* recommending the founding of theological seminaries. (Godbold, *The Church College*, p. 34) After the Civil War, Bishop Holland McTyeire led a movement to establish a school of theology in the South, but he was opposed by the General Conference of 1870. However, the Tennessee Conference in 1872 initiated a drive to found a university (with a theological school) and by good fortune secured the patronage of Cornelius Vanderbilt of New York. Named in his honor, Vanderbilt opened its doors in 1875. (See Hurst, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 1366 ff.)

By 1840, when Methodists were still debating theological education, the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed, and Unitarians had established altogether about 25 theological schools. The first such school, Andover (in Massachusetts), was begun in 1808. (William Warren Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930], p. 363.)

Denominations other than Methodists which were opposed at first to education for the clergy were Quakers, Baptists, Disciples, United Brethren, and Universalists. (Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 90.)

32. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

33. Cited in *ibid.*, p. 25.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-32.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 29. This phrase recalls a couplet from Charles Wesley's hymn written for the opening of Kingswood School: "Unite the pair so long disjoined,/ Knowledge and vital piety...." (From "Come Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," Hymn 344, *Methodist Hymnal* [Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1964, 1966].)

37. Paul Neff Garber, *The Romance of American Methodism* (Greensboro: The Piedmont Press, 1931), pp. 42-44; Brubacher and Rudy, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43; Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 66- 67.

38. Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-35.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67, 135.

40. See Frank Baker, "John Wesley and Cokesbury College's First President," pp. 54-56 for details.

41. *Mission Statement*, p. 14. Or was McCloskey a relative of John McClaskey/McCloskey, a Methodist itinerant preacher and Irish immigrant, who sent his son George to Cokesbury College? (See Jordan, *op. cit.*, pp. 49 ff. and Baker, "J. W. and Cokesbury College's First President," p. 57.

42. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30; Daniels, *op. cit.*, p. 510; Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 20. Asbury seems to have been glad to have been rid of all three. Clark, *op. cit.*, II, p. 38.

Wesley tried to persuade Heath to return to England, with his wife and two young daughters (of whom Wesley was especially fond), even promising him funds to make the voyage, but Heath chose to remain in America. He served various Episcopal parishes until his death in 1806. (Baker, "John Wesley and Cokesbury College's First President," pp. 57-59.)

43. Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-20.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

46. Tewksbury calculates the "failure rate" of colleges founded before the Civil War in the sixteen states he studied at 81%--that is, more than eight out of ten of them had ceased to exist by 1927 when he wrote, most of them long before. (Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 27.)

47. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-42.

48. Clark, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 102-103. The *Discipline* of 1798 sets forth a recommended "Plan of Education" for "all our Seminaries of Learning" based, very largely, on the Cokesbury College Plan described above. (Frederick A. Norwood, ed., *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America*, 1798, facsimile edition [Rutland, Vt.: Academy Books, 1979], pp. 180-84.

49. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72; Jordan, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-57.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 44-57.

51. *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-84. Asbury probably was involved in the establishing of several other short-lived academies (*ibid.*, pp. 65-69; Garber, *op. cit.*, p. 212). He is said to have been instrumental in the launching of several state colleges (later universities): South Carolina and Georgia, and possibly North Carolina. (Cf. Garber, *op. cit.*, pp. 206- 07.)

53. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-93; Nathan Bangs, *A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Carlton and Porter, 1857), III, pp. 74-75.

54. Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-109.

55. It continued about five years only; see Cummings' Chart A, p. 426.

56. Cited in Bangs, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 105-06. Cf. Godbold, *The Church College*, pp. 34-35.

57. Cf. Bangs, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 269-71; IV, p. 4.

58. Daniel Stevenson, "Augustana College," in Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-16; Hurst, *op. cit.*, III, p. 242; VI, pp. 1074-75; McTyeire, *op. cit.*, p. 659.

59. Cummings, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

60. Cited in Godbold, *The Church College*, p. 55.

61. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-37; Godbold, "Methodism and Higher Education," pp. 116-17. The original building, abandoned and falling into ruins, still may be seen today.

62. Edward Cooke, "Wesleyan College," in Cummings, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-86; Hurst, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 980-82.

63. That is, in 1927 when Tewksbury made his study; see *op. cit.*, pp. 104-105.

64. Consulting lists in Cummings and DuBose, I count about 35 schools called "colleges" or "universities" founded between 1830 and 1861 by either the M.E. or M.E.South churches which had short life spans. There were an even larger number of Methodist "academies," "seminaries," and "institutes."

65. Godbold, *The Church College*, p. 45.

66. Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University* (New York: Vintage Books/Random House, 1962), p. 57.

67. See Godbold, *The Church College*, pp. 48-81, where ample supporting evidence is given for each point, with quotations from Methodist sources in nearly all instances. Tewksbury mentions also the fear Protestants had of Catholic colleges, then being founded especially by Jesuits (pp. 74- 75).

Evolution of the Methodist Link with Louisburg College

by George-Anne Willard

Almost eighty years ago, on March 27, 1909, Louisburg College officially and legally became "related" to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. By that date the necessary deeds were registered, the North Carolina Legislature had enacted enabling legislation, and the church had appointed a new board of college trustees.

An unofficial link between church and college, however, had existed for many years prior to the legal transfer of the college property into the hands of the Methodist Church.[1] Louisburg College was not one of the institutions directly founded by the Methodist Church; rather, it fitted into the category referred to by Dr. Ricketts as "privately owned but 'operated in the interest of' the Methodist Church." Louisburg College functioned in the Methodist tradition from its very beginnings, but there were periods when the link with the church was stronger and more apparent than others.

In 1787, the same year that Cokesbury opened in Maryland, a similar academy was planned by the community leaders of Louisburg, North Carolina. The town recently had hosted the first Annual Conference of the Methodist Church in America. The Conference had been held in April 1785 at the home of the Reverend Green Hill, Sr., with Francis Asbury, Thomas Coke, and Dr. John King among those in attendance. Thus, from its beginnings the town of Louisburg had a rich Methodist heritage, and during its first century was a predominantly Methodist community.

A brief look at the ancestry chart of Louisburg College shows the "father" of the college to be Franklin Male Academy, which was chartered by the North Carolina Legislature in 1787. (The Franklin Academy building is located on the east campus of the college and has been recently renovated.) The "mother" of Louisburg College was Louisburg Female Academy, chartered in 1814.

A number of Methodist laymen were associated with the development of the two academies. One prominent trustee of both schools was Green Hill, Jr., son of the noted Methodist leader the Reverend Green Hill. The Reverend John King served as one of the original trustees of the Male Academy, and his son Joel King was for many years the treasurer of the Female Academy. Typical of their era, both of the early academies sought not only to impart knowledge but also to inculcate religious and moral values in their students.

During the 1840s and 1850s, the Louisburg Female Academy was headed by principals Asher Ray and his wife Jane Curtis Ray. Asher Ray was a leading member of the local Methodist Church, and during his tenure, the academy achieved a reputation as a distinctly Methodist school. The 1850s was a decade when North Carolina citizens were demonstrating increasing support for the establishment of colleges for women. The administration of Asher and Jane Ray laid the basis for the transformation of Louisburg Female Academy into Louisburg Female College.

Louisburg Female College first opened to students in the fall of 1857. The college became increasingly viewed by the public as a Methodist school. Among its early presidents were Methodists James Southgate, Jr., who served from 1862 to 1865, and Turner Myrick Jones, who served from 1866 to 1868. Dr. Jones became best known for his twenty-six years as president of Greensboro Female College, but during his brief tenure in Louisburg, he established a rich curriculum and a high standard of scholarship, and he espoused lofty goals for women's education. In the judgment of his contemporary, the Reverend Frank L. Reid, Jones did "more for the education of females than any other man in the State."[2]

Turner M. Jones believed women had a special, "holy, and sublime mission on earth" that made it imperative that they be well educated and "surrounded with the very best moral and religious influences."[3] The views of Jones mirrored those of other advocates of women's education in North Carolina--it was deemed important to elevate the "moral and intellectual character of women" because they would be the ones to rear the future leaders of America. The "elevation of woman" was considered to be "inseparably intertwined with the social and moral progress" of the nation.[4]

While Turner Jones served as president of Louisburg Female College, students were expected to enroll in a course known as "Evidences of Christianity." They were encouraged to dress plainly, to wear only one piece of jewelry, and to refrain from dancing. Each school day opened and closed with religious services, and all students were required to attend Sunday services at the local Methodist Church.[5] (Since there were some 133 students, the Louisburg Methodist Church generally had a full sanctuary.)

After Dr. Jones left Louisburg College, the institution experienced a period of great uncertainty during the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s. The college had a rough road to travel in the last half of the nineteenth century. It endured the trials and tribulations of civil war and reconstruction, and it survived two serious economic depressions. For two years during the 1870s, the Baptists tried their hand at running the college. Dr. William Royall, minister, missionary, and former Wake Forest College professor, was president of Louisburg Female College during 1872 and 1873. Although the *Biblical Recorder* endorsed the idea of a female college in Louisburg, Baptist interest seems to have ended when Royall relinquished his position as president.

Louisburg Female College was soon once again under Methodist guidance. The next efforts at reviving the college were sponsored by the Raleigh District Methodists, who for five years (from 1876 to 1881) promoted the college as the district female school.

The Raleigh District had been offered the use of the college building rent-free; it did not assume ownership of the property. The District Conference appointed a six-man board of directors to run the school, and Frank Lewis Reid was selected as college president. The twenty-four-year-old Reid was serving as pastor of the Louisburg Methodist Church and later became owner and editor of the *Christian Advocate*. Including Reid, there were evidently four instructors on the college faculty, and classes were offered for students of all ages (from kindergarten through college).

Even though the college was endorsed as the district school, advertisements in the *Christian Advocate* made clear that the "denominational connection" did not mean that the college was "sectarian" in nature. Rather, each student was permitted to attend the church of her choice, and efforts were made to prevent "bigotry" and to "cultivate liberal Christian views and feelings."[6]

During the period that Louisburg College operated under the auspices of the Raleigh District Conference, the conference provided no financial support for the school but did actively encourage Methodists to patronize the college. Because many Methodists in the area were unable to afford to send their daughters to college during the hard times of the 1870s, the cost of tuition and board at Louisburg Female College was deliberately kept low ($20 per session in tuition for the higher English course and $10 per month for board). In spite of the low cost, enrollment at the college was modest--about fifty students.

In 1881, the district conference shifted its endorsement to a school in Cary, and no one filled the position as president of Louisburg College until 1889 when the property was leased to the Reverend S. D. Bagley, former head of Littleton Female College. The college catalogue issued by Bagley in 1890 stated that only by becoming "scholarly and accomplished" could women "fulfill the mission for which God created them" (which was to be a Christian influence in the world).[7] Because of the economic depression that hit North Carolina in the 1890s, Bagley found it difficult to collect student tuition. He was able to educate his own daughters at the college, but was unable to make any profits.

With the prospects looking gloomy for the survival of the college, local citizens contacted the Durham industrialist and philanthropist, Washington Duke, and asked him to save the school. It was hoped that Duke would preserve the Methodist tradition of Louisburg College. As it turned out, Duke saved the college not once, but twice. He purchased the college property in 1891 at a cost of $5,450, and he

considered renaming the school in honor of his only daughter, Mary Duke. One can only speculate as to the fate of the school had it received the name Duke College. No name change occurred, however.

In 1894, Duke agreed to sell the college property to a group of Louisburg Methodists, who wished to make the school a denominational college and place it under the control of the North Carolina Conference. The Reverend J. A. Green, pastor of the Louisburg Methodist Church, became the new college president. Once again, the college advertised low rates "to suit hard times," and promised that the daughters of ministers would be exempted from paying tuition. The new management of the college also promised that although it was a denominational school, nothing would be "said, done or taught to tend in any way to change any preconceived or established church doctrine."[8] President Green submitted annual reports to the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Church, just as his predecessor Bagley had done.

Though prospects for the college were viewed as hopeful, its new owners were not able to make the required payments to Washington Duke and ownership of the property reverted to Duke in 1896. Duke gave serious consideration to discontinuing the school at this point, but was persuaded by the Louisburg Methodist minister to keep the school open under the management of Mary Davis.

Mary Davis had been teaching at the college for five years and had achieved a reputation as a talented and successful teacher of language, logic, and literature. The source of her popularity was explained by the *Franklin Times* as follows: "She possesses the peculiar faculty of interesting the minds of her pupils, thereby making the work she requires of them a pleasure, their hearts she wins by her bright and affable manner, while her kind but firm discipline compels their respect."[9]

When the fall term began in 1896, Mary Davis bore the title of "lady principal." Her father, Matthew S. Davis, was given the title of "president"; after his death in 1906, Mary Davis became the first (and only) woman to be president of Louisburg College. She was always the one, however, with whom Duke corresponded concerning the physical and financial needs of the college.

Duke was very pleased with the "good management" of the college under the Davis family and permitted them to use the property rent-free.[10] Duke also paid the necessary taxes and insurance fees. Thus, Matthew Davis could report to the North Carolina Annual Conference that Duke's assistance made it possible to fulfill the college purpose: "to place higher education within easy reach of young ladies of limited means."[11] Board and tuition cost $57.50 for a twenty-week session. In the fall of 1901, there were 198 students enrolled at Louisburg College--12 worked to help pay their way, 10 were preachers' daughters who paid only board, and 7 were orphans who attended free.[12]

President Matthew Davis was an experienced educator and an active lay leader in the Methodist Church. He believed that "*Christian* education should constitute the basis of all education." It was his view that "education and religion should go hand in hand," and students should be fitted "not only for this life but for the life to come." Each student at Louisburg College, according to Davis, was "surrounded by a moral and religious atmosphere" that exerted "a wholesome influence in moulding her character for life."[13] All of the boarding students at the college belonged to the newly formed chapter of the Young Women's Christian Association. Every school day began with Bible readings, singing, and prayer. Every evening at sunset the pupils gathered in the YWCA room for a fifteen minute prayer meeting conducted by one of the students.

In his reports to the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Church, M. S. Davis annually reiterated the fact that Louisburg College was "a distinctively Methodist school." He wanted it to be clearly understood that, in accordance with the wishes of Washington Duke, the college was "owned and controlled by Methodists" and "run in the interest of the Methodist Church."[14] Washington Duke and Matthew Davis died within a year of each other, and the fate of Louisburg College was once again in question.

Mary Davis, who was now Mrs. Ivey Allen, was requested by the college board of directors to meet with Benjamin N. Duke to discuss the future of the college. Louisburg College subsequently underwent a change in ownership, which was effected over a two-year period. Benjamin Duke, who was one of Washington Duke's sons, offered the college property to the North Carolina Conference in 1907, but the legal transfer was not completed until 1909. The property was tendered "in fee simple," and the only stipulation of Duke's gift was that the property be used solely for educational purposes. Since the college had "long been run in the interest of the Methodist Church" and was judged to have already achieved "great work in the cause of Christian education," the offer of the property was promptly accepted.[15]

At the Annual Conference in 1907, a special committee (composed of A. P. Tyler, L. S. Massey, and D. B. Zollicoffer) was appointed to take charge of the college and "to make all necessary arrangements for its legal transfer to the Conference."[16] When the Annual Conference met in 1908, a nine-man board of trustees was appointed for the college. Mary Davis Allen continued to serve as college president.

In February 1909, the North Carolina General Assembly ratified a bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate Louisburg Female College...for the purpose of maintaining a school of high grade...for the intellectual, moral and religious development and training of young ladies." The "corporators" were the nine trustees of the college, who were empowered to select the college president and other officers. The college might acquire property, but the trustees had to secure permission from the North Carolina

Conference before mortgaging or selling any college property. The law further stated, "All bequests and donations shall be the property of the North Carolina Conference."[17]

In a deed registered in March 1909, Benjamin N. Duke and his wife Sarah P. Duke formally conveyed the college property to the trustees of Louisburg Female College "in order to encourage and promote the educational interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South."[18] With the transfer of ownership complete, plans were made to enlarge and re-equip the college. Supporters of the institution spoke of "a brighter dawn" for the school and of a "new" and revitalized Louisburg College.[19]

Eighty years have passed since Benjamin N. Duke made his gift to Methodism. Louisburg College has become closely identified with those people in eastern North Carolina who call themselves United Methodists. Our meeting place today, the Clifton L. Benson Chapel and Religious Life Center, symbolizes the continued commitment of United Methodists in this state to higher education and to Louisburg College. The Raleigh District United Methodist Men spearheaded a fund drive that made possible the construction of this building in 1986.

In 1986 and 1987, Louisburg College celebrated its bicentennial as the oldest two-year, coeducational, church-related college in America. During the celebration, special recognition was given to the important role that Methodists of this area have played in creating the rich heritage of service that characterizes Louisburg College--a heritage which has emphasized the importance of access to educational opportunity in a democratic society.

Notes

1. For further information relating to the history of Louisburg College and its link with the Methodist Church, see *Louisburg College Echoes: Voices from the Formative Years, 1787-1917, with a Summary of the Expansion Years, 1917-1987* by George-Anne Willard (Louisburg, N. C.: Louisburg College, 1988).

2. Samuel Bryant Turrentine, *A Romance of Education* (Greensboro: The Piedmont Press, 1946), pp. 93-98.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

4. Commencement addresses delivered at Louisburg Female Academy (1855) and Louisburg Female College (1858), North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

5. *Louisburg Female College Catalogue*, 1867.

6. *Christian Advocate*, December 20, 1876.

7. *Louisburg Female College Catalogue*, 1890.

8. *Franklin Times*, July 6, July 27, 1894.

9. *Ibid.*, July 27, 1894.

10. Benjamin N. Duke Letterbooks, March 15, 1897, Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N. C.

11. Report to North Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, 1899, Louisburg College Archives.

12. *Ibid.*, 1901.

13. *Ibid.*, 1899, 1903.

14. *Ibid.*, 1896.

15. *Ibid.*, 1907.

16. *Ibid.*

17. Private Laws of North Carolina, on file in the Office of the Secretary of State.

18. Franklin County Deeds, March 27, 1909.

19. *Louisburg Echoes*, December 1908.

Access to Higher Education in a Changing Society

by Steven E. Brooks

Introduction

Higher education does not operate in a vacuum, or even in some abstract "ivory tower." Rather, it is a vital and dynamic part of a societal whole, and as such it both reflects and responds to the direction of the larger society. It is reflective in that social change is frequently mirrored by accompanying change in institutions of higher education; it is responsive to economic and political trends in society as it seeks to maintain its position of prominence and respect within the society.

There are, of course, numerous instances in which this mirroring and responding process might be illustrated over the past 352 years since the founding of Harvard College. You will be undoubtedly relieved to learn that I do not intend to discuss all of them this afternoon. I do want to provide a brief background to illustrate the interaction of higher education with societal change, and I want to identify two major processes in the society--processes which higher education has reflected. The first is a movement away from a deferential society dominated by an elite group of socially prominent men toward a more democratic society open to full participation by all citizens. This democratization has been paralleled by an accompanying alteration of American institutions of all types away from earlier hierarchical models and toward unique expressions of the American experience.

The second major process has been the movement during the last century or so toward a credential-based society. As the demand for credential-based professionalism has grown, the role of higher education within American society has become increasingly important. Urbanization and industrialization (as well as the "progressive" response to their worst abuses) have in many ways defined and shaped American higher education for more than a century. Indeed, the linkage between societal needs for specific training and research and the ability of higher education to meet those needs has provided the current prestigious position in which the post-secondary community finds itself. This connection has also been the source of political and financial support for our enterprise.

To illustrate these processes let us examine briefly the evolution of American higher education since the founding of Harvard. As the purpose of this paper is to examine the historical issue of "access"--who goes to college--I will not attempt to

focus on every issue of educational change, but rather on those which serve to illuminate the changing beneficiaries of higher education. I will provide brief examinations of several earlier periods in American history, with a more detailed analysis of the years since the end of the second World War.

Colleges, Democratization, and Credentials

Higher education in colonial English-America evolved both from attempts to model life after the Old World heritage and as a response to the altered conditions experienced in the New World. The English settlers who came to America brought with them an intellectual framework based upon a sense of order derived from a theistic social system of deference to one's betters. This social system was hierarchical, and a person's place within it was relatively fixed and unchanging. The institutions founded by the earliest settlers quite naturally reflected their view of the world. They sought in large part to replicate English institutions in the wilderness, and among those institutions were colleges. Most of these early colleges were founded by ministers of various Christian denominations. While their major purpose was ministerial training, other colonial leaders also received post-secondary education from the beginning (Brubacher and Rudy). In all cases, however, these early colleges remained enclaves for the elite--the places where the "better sort" in a deferential society could be educated as befitted their position. And while limited scholarships were established by some individuals from the very beginning, there is little evidence of genuine concern for more generally open access to higher education.

As the 18th century progressed the values of a theistic society became ever more secular. Colleges mirrored this change in the basis of values; institutions founded on a theistic world view became more humanistic in outlook. Yet even as the reason behind social values in America changed over time the old sense of mission remained. Colleges continued to train ministers and other leaders of this mission, and thus they remained elitist in character up to the time of the American Revolution. If one posits the American Revolution as the radical ideation and articulation of a century and a half of colonial experience (Bailyn), one can view that seminal episode as a process through which the colonists discovered that they were not Englishmen and other immigrants living in America, but Americans living in a nation of their own (Wood).

The very success of the war effort accelerated this ideation of experience. After the fighting concluded, Americans made a concerted effort to institutionalize their newly expressed ideas. Among the institutions thus created were nineteen colleges which have survived to this day. These were all founded between 1780 and 1800, when in the 150 previous years only 9 colleges had been established (Rudolph). Higher education, then, was an expression of the rise of republicanism and the

resulting need for a virtuous, educated group of leaders. But while this republican ideal led to the founding of a number of public post-secondary institutions, the very nature of the Jeffersonian understanding betrayed the still elite disposition of the colleges--as well as the lack of direct connection with the economic needs of society. Political leadership for a virtuous republic, with its implied need for college training, resulted in an increase in the number of institutions providing that training, but economic potential still remained largely unrelated to the college experience.

Oddly, the next wave of colleges founded in the United States reflected both an increasingly democratic society and, at the same time, an anti-intellectual trend. This can be symbolized by the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828. Jackson represented the most democratic tendencies of Jeffersonian thought; central to his successful political effort was the theme of the elevation of the common man. Under Jackson it became popular to disparage formal education as requisite to political leadership; the old sense of the need for an educated elite leadership to guide the republic gave way to the muddy-booted democrats dancing on the White House furniture at Jackson's inaugural (Ward). Existing colleges came under criticism for their elitist composition.

Yet even as colleges were being criticized, another strain of Jacksonian thought actually encouraged the formation of more colleges. Much of the impetus toward antebellum reform in American society was based in denominational Christianity; among the many new institutions formed during this era were numerous denominational colleges. In part this stemmed from the quest for moral perfection, in part it derived from a sense of denominational boosterism, but in the main it was a part of the Jacksonian emphasis on equality. Under the new, democratic ideology, even the most stagnant backwater in America could establish its own college and thereby gain "equality" with other towns (Tyler). The founding of such narrow institutions of learning paradoxically perpetuated the anti-intellectualism of Jacksonian democracy while extending the college experience to some students who would formerly have been left out. This more inclusive quality for higher education was still only for the few, and the greater inclusiveness is best seen in the "special interest" character of many of the new colleges. For the next several decades after Jackson this college-building wave continued. Suddenly there existed colleges for women, colleges for Catholics, colleges even for the poor. But this wave of special interest colleges founded on some narrow focus had little to do with any broad national commitment to higher education for large numbers of the population (Jencks and Riesman).

By the time of the failure of the War for Southern Independence, then, higher education in America was still offered primarily to a small group of people, most of whom came from family backgrounds which marked them as privileged. The failure of the Southern revolution began to change the components of higher education in ways which ultimately altered its elitist nature.

With the triumph of the North in 1865, one can mark the dominance of the industrial over the agrarian ideal in American life. With this triumph came widespread recognition that society would change, and that an industrializing society would have different requirements for higher education. Over time this gave rise to the "university movement" (Rudolph), which was fueled by the need for scientific and agricultural progress, as the magnificent economic growth experienced by Americans was accompanied by technical educational needs. And as industrialization progressed there was an increasing demand for professional managers of industry; this demand accelerated into a management revolution after 1900. Professional training became more and more a prerequisite for job entry. The linkage of higher education with material success thus began the movement toward a credential-based society. Grounded in a progressive faith in humanity's ability to solve its problems by objective attention to them, this "university movement" led to specialization of faculty as well as curricula. Still, while more Americans than ever before were attending post-secondary institutions there was not yet any societal urging for mass higher education. That would come only after 1945.

Fostering Access and Choice in the Postwar Years

Perhaps the most significant time in the evolution of higher education into a democratic enterprise came at the close of the second World War. One of the most obvious and popular desires of the electorate was to reward the men and women who had won the great victory; and what better way to do so than by helping them attain economic success? Since access to higher education had by this time become linked in the popular mind with access to economic opportunity, one reward was issued in the form of federal funding for post-secondary training of veterans. The veterans who rushed to take advantage of the nation's grateful generosity formed a vast wave of democratization for higher education--popularizing the idea of college education for the masses. The Truman Commission of 1948 anticipated that this trend would continue, and called for federal scholarship assistance to help achieve the goal of democratizing higher education, which was increasingly being seen as a logical means of fulfilling the goal of equal economic opportunity for many Americans.

On this issue, as on so many others, however, President Truman was ahead of his time. For more than a decade after World War II there was no popular demand for federal involvement in student assistance. In 1957, however, an external event galvanized public opinion. The Soviet launching of Sputnik in the fall of that year evoked an outcry from the American people, who were culturally unprepared to be second-best in anything, especially second to the Russians in outer space. Would the Soviets press their new scientific superiority into advanced weaponry? How had Americans allowed such a dangerous event to take place? Who was to blame for the apparent American inferiority? Certainly not the Congress, that body promptly asserted. The real problem, the Congress said, lay in "the 'weakness' of the

American educational system" and required a "new, dynamic, and total commitment to the problems facing higher education" (McCormick, 1972).

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was one result of this new "commitment." If America lacked scientists and mathematicians, it must find them. To do so it must be certain that no talented individual would be denied an opportunity for the training required to develop his or her needed skills. Among the provisions of the new Act was the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program, designed to assist needy students planning studies in science or mathematics or preparing to become educators in those subjects. Unlike the G.I. Bill, this aid was to be based on a demonstrated need for funds; it was to function not as a reward for prior service but as a means of assuring the nation an adequate supply of people trained in essential fields. While this aid was therefore targeted at a special group, its emphasis on demonstrated need as a qualification for assistance set a precedent for future federal efforts, which would henceforth be devoted to the idea of assuring access to higher education for all possessing the requisite talents.

The push for access would continue into the 1960s. During the Kennedy Administration long-standing concerns in Congress regarding both the expansion of the federal role in higher education and the thorny issues concerning separation of church and state continued to block increased federal student aid programs--while most opponents did not quarrel with the idea of promoting access, they did argue over how to do so. These concerns, which had been temporarily suspended in the defense "emergency" of 1958, were put aside again after Kennedy's assassination and the landslide election of Lyndon Johnson in 1964. Johnson swept into office with him a progressive congressional majority the likes of which had not been seen since the high point of the New Deal some forty years earlier. With this new majority it became possible once again to enact sweeping new social policies designed to benefit those excluded from the mainstream in America (Moynihan, 1986).

In this new political climate the old reservations regarding proper federal government roles gave way to a growing national commitment to the ideology of equal opportunity. This ideology was reflected in the War on Poverty and Great Society programs of the Johnson Administration. The concern with poverty in the midst of plenty produced programs such as Medicare; concerns over equality were expressed in passage of civil rights, voting rights, and housing legislation. This growing commitment also resulted in enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which focused on student financial aid as a means of fostering access to college and on the issue of choice for students regarding the type of institution they would attend. The decision to make student aid sensitive to the price of an institution recognized the vital contribution made by independent colleges and universities and acknowledged the benefits to society of diversity in the educational marketplace. However, limited availability of funds dictated that access to some form of higher

education was the more dominant federal goal. The basic belief in promoting access and choice as national efforts attained strong, bipartisan support in the Congress (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976, pp.3-18).

A similar consensus began to emerge at the state level during these same years. This has resulted in state programs across the nation which also attempt to promote access and choice and which together with the federal efforts have made a significant impact on the ability of the nation to offer post-secondary opportunity to Americans from all socioeconomic groups. However, the main player has been (and continues to be) the federal government, and for that reason I want to focus on that arena. Our question basically concerns the emergence of consensus regarding access to higher education and students' ability to choose those institutions best serving their needs. How did the consensus come about, and how has it continued through the last quarter of a century, during which wide swings in the national political temper have occurred? What has been the real purpose of federal policy? Has this purpose ever been completely clear, or have different forces driven the diverse federal efforts--at last count including four different loan programs, three grants, and a work-study program?

The Policy Arena

Among all the experts who have examined the purposes of the federal efforts in student financial assistance, Gladieux and Wolanin (1976) have perhaps offered the most satisfactory analysis of the federal policy making field. They argue that new policies are historically not created through a vast uprooting of existing practices; rather, programs in place are the customary beginning points for subsequent federal activity. Current procedures and practices, that is, customarily define the practical limits of political debate. They also have suggested a model of the federal "policy arena," in which national decisions relating to higher education are made.

This arena, bounded by political realities as perceived by the actors within it, contains a "subgovernment" of close, long-standing connections among members and staffs of the Congressional committees concerned with education, the U.S. Office (or Department) of Education and selected "Washington representatives of higher education associations" (p. 252). It is within this subgovernment that political decisions concerning higher education are made.

This model of the policy arena also accounts for three environmental factors which together form its boundaries. The first is termed "political culture," the fundamental societal consensus which defines the limits of public debate. The culture reflects broad agreement on federal policy goals and on the means to be employed in attaining those goals. This culture is not static; rather, it reflects "a

moving consensus" (p. 255). By 1972 this consensus was evolving toward the assumption by the federal government of a greater role in the field of higher education, aimed primarily at the quest for equal educational opportunity.

The second set of forces bounding the policy arena are public attitudes toward higher education. Insofar as higher education has come to be regarded as an enterprise essential to the development of individual potential, public support for higher education has increased. But there is an essential difference in the public attitudes supporting higher education and those, say, surrounding crime control. While both issues may be regarded by the general population as proper and even necessary areas for federal policy, higher education needs lack urgency in the public perception. This view of aid to higher education as desirable but not pressing has colored the policy arena and the decisions made within it.

This has led to a third constraint on the policy arena, the availability of resources. While student aid had experienced a "bull market" (p. 256) throughout the 1970s, the model recognized the effect which public attitudes regarding the urgency of student financial aid programs might have in an era of diminished resources.

This model of the policy arena bounded by a moving consensus reconciles the apparent conflict between those who have emphasized the fragmented nature of diverse federal student aid programs and those who have instead stressed the underlying theme of equal opportunity which unites the modern federal efforts. The "no goals" argument is that aid programs have been targeted at momentarily popular social desires, often in reaction to a crisis real or perceived, with a lack of overall purpose or conceptual clarity, and in an irregular and haphazard fashion. This emphasis, on the surface, seems quite accurate. Yet it misses the underlying ideology which has evolved in support of federal involvement in student financial aid. This ideology is the political culture defined by Gladieux and Wolanin; its moving consensus had not yet been fully articulated in 1958 when the National Defense Education Act was passed by Congress. By 1972 the consensus had been formed around the rationale of equal opportunity, probably as much as a part of Lyndon Johnson's assault on poverty as for any other reason. Since 1972 the consensus has experienced numerous shifts; it continues and must by its very nature continue to undergo modification.

Perhaps it is this changeable quality of the underlying ideology which has caused Van Dusen (1979) to muse that Rube Goldberg must have designed the federal student financial aid programs; nevertheless, he concluded, the system seemingly so haphazard has one uniting feature: it works well for large numbers of students. Perhaps this good effect has been achieved because, no matter how diverse in appearance the programs are, they are all reasonably consistent with the underlying ideology of democracy in the United States. The successive Administra-

tions of Presidents Johnson, Nixon, and Carter, each in different ways and at different times, emphasized the desirability of a national commitment to access to higher education regardless of family ability to pay the ever-increasing costs of that education.

While at first the higher education community viewed the 1968 election of Richard Nixon with concern, Nixon was surprisingly supportive of a student aid effort by the federal government, and while his appointees in the Office of Education and elsewhere in the federal bureaucracy had certainly earned the distrust of Congressional staffs and many career Office of Education professionals, there was no public effort to dismantle student financial assistance. Indeed, the Nixon Administration had proposed the creation of an entitlement grant centered on direct access to college. Although in the proposal this new program was to be accompanied by a substantial reduction in campus-based federal student aid, Nixon found it easier to achieve enactment of a new program than to reduce the funding of popular existing programs; the result was a significant expansion of aid opportunities.

Nixon's motives in pressing for student aid reflect the dominance of the prevailing national consensus. The President found the issue interesting mainly for its potential effect on his electoral success. During the famous recorded "smoking gun" conversation which later confirmed Nixon's downfall in the Watergate scandal, the President revealed his attitude toward the 1972 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. In wondering whether or not he should sign the Bill, he repeatedly questioned his aides concerning the "sex appeal" of the measure. "How it would play in Peoria" was apparently the basis of decision-making on this, as on so many other issues, in the Nixon Administration (Froelicher, 1982). And Peoria apparently supported the idea of universal access to higher education.

Nixon was not alone, of course, in shaping policy decisions to public desires. By fall, 1977, during the term of President Carter, political pressure was building in Congress to provide some college cost relief to the economic middle class. The source of this pressure was a middle-income citizenry which felt "squeezed out of college by rapidly rising costs because they are too 'rich' to qualify for student aid and too 'poor' to pay themselves" (Hansen and Gladieux, 1978). Assuring access to post-secondary education as well as some measure of choice as to the type of educational experience desired had been stated national policy in student aid for over a decade; the middle income family now demanded the extension of that policy to them as well (Johnson, 1980).

Secretary of HEW Joseph Califano later described this middle class of Americans as those "who...work, pay the taxes, and who are so desperately pressed in terms of the higher education of their children" (U.S. Congress, 1978). Whether the Secretary was correct in designating middle income Americans as "desperately pressed" was and remains controversial. In 1977 the real costs of higher education,

after making inflationary adjustments both in college expenses and disposable income, had not actually increased significantly compared with earlier years; there appeared to be more of a problem with life-style expectations among the middle class than a real squeeze on limited resources (Martin, 1980; Hansen and Gladieux, 1978).

The reality of a squeeze was unimportant in the political context of 1978, however, since it was the perception of that reality among the politically articulate middle class which created the pressure on the Congress. The immediate challenge in 1977 was a proposed income tax credit to be taken against tuition costs. The measure was popular among a wide spectrum of the electorate, but was opposed by the Carter Administration as too costly (in terms of lost revenue) and as inherently "unfair." The President stated that he would veto any such "inefficient and inequitable means of using scarce federal resources to provide financial help to needy middle-income families" (Hansen and Gladieux, 1978).

Carter did not offer any positive alternative, however. In the absence of concrete proposals from the Administration, Congressman William Ford, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, realized that tax credits were so charging the political atmosphere that a significant expansion of student aid might finally be feasible. Previously Ford and others wanting to expand student financial aid opportunities to more Americans had been unable to put together a successful coalition, because of opposition from the right (regarding expenditure of too much money) and from the left (civil rights groups feared that extension to the middle class would erode the amount of funding available to the poor, who were the "proper" targets of federal assistance). Under the pressure of tax credits, however, Ford saw the opportunity to persuade the liberals that the base had to be expanded-that in order to get broad, popular support for student aid programs the middle class had to be included as recipients. (Ford, Martin, and Butts, 1979).

With somewhat reluctant Administration endorsement the Middle Income Student Assistance Act was approved. Suddenly student financial aid was big business. Vastly increased governmental expenditures and a growing target population were trends continued and even expanded in the 1980 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Underscoring the vital importance of student financial assistance was its prominent place in the newly created Department of Education. To proponents of student aid as the best and fairest means of fostering access and choice, nirvana seemed to have arrived.

Any such illusions were shattered by the election of November, 1980. Ronald Reagan was elected on a platform calling for budget reductions and the dismantling of the Department of Education. If Jimmy Carter had seemed unaware of the needs of students or reluctant to spend the funds necessary to meet those needs, the new President seemed deliberately anti-education. Differences with the Carter

Department of Education there had been; on countless issues the Department had moved in a confused, unsteady manner, creating delays in delivery of financial aid to campuses and students. Yet, under Carter, the questions really were debates among friendly rivals over how much could reasonably be afforded in order to provide both access to and choice of post-secondary opportunity to all Americans. Further, these differences were settled between an Executive and a Congress controlled by the same political party. And the Congress was friendly to student aid issues.

The Reagan Reaction and its Aftermath

After the election of 1980, however, the cast of characters changed. Not only was there a new President, portending changes in the Department of Education, but the new Senate would be controlled by the Republicans for the first time since student aid had been in existence. And while most Senate Republicans were supportive of student aid, it was unclear how their support would continue when a new President of their own party called for spending reductions. Further, the staff members on the key Senate committees and subcommittees would change as party control shifted; a number of familiar staffers would be reassigned to other duties, and others would simply disappear from the Capitol. The relationships developed within the "subgovernment" for more than two decades were threatened, and it was uncertain how aid policy would be made in future.

The new Administration launched an immediate assault on the aid programs, seeking reductions of 56% in its first proposed budget. Congressional support for the aid programs was sufficiently strong, however, that this extreme proposal was immediately rejected. The intention, however, was clear: the Reagan Administration wanted to force a renewed national debate regarding student aid, arguing that while access for the "truly needy" was an appropriate national goal, choice was a marketplace area where the government should not intrude.

Thus even with its antipathy to domestic spending for social welfare the Reagan Administration was unable to argue publicly against the national consensus on access. Their arguments instead focused on the proper targets for aid in an era of limited resources, arguing that the traditional family responsibility to pay for college was being undermined by federal largesse. Their case against student aid, then, was made not on the basis of public disagreement with its rationale, but instead on grounds that it had become excessive, that it should be better targeted on the impoverished. The Reagan reaction spent most of its time and political capital arguing over means rather than ends, over the restriction of resources to a smaller group rather than desirability of the goal of universal access.

Public attitudes bounding the policy arena apparently continue to support the role of the federal government in providing access to educational opportunity. The

consensus has shifted, but its shifts have come within a narrow band of pervasive public agreement; it would require a revolution in basic values well beyond the popularity of the Reagan reaction to effect a denial of the goal of equal opportunity. The major reductions desired by the Reagan Administration were never achieved; they succeeded only in limiting the growth of the funds available for student aid. Even this limitation was based more on scarcity of funds in an era of record federal indebtedness than on any philosophical backing away from the commitment to access. And today we are treated to the ultimate evidence that access and choice remain viable national goals: both presidential candidates are busily seeking favor with a public strongly supportive of aid to college students. The future for student aid is not dim; fostering access and choice will continue to be national policy.

Yet we do now live in an era in which any new initiatives must necessarily be limited by the vast debts we owe. While the prevailing political culture and its underlying popular consensus are strongly supportive of access, they are less favorably inclined to provide a full measure of choice. Indeed, a 1985 survey by The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities reported that parents generally felt that private colleges are prohibitively expensive, that saving for college education reduces already slender chances for obtaining financial aid, and thus believe that choice is not affordable for them.

Given federal constraints and a negative public attitude regarding choice, those of us involved in church-related higher education clearly have a job to do. We must not only work to assure that public policy makers at the federal, state, and even local levels help prove the opinions of those parents wrong. We must also work to assure that the importance of educational diversity remains clear to the general public. We must be worthy of our additional cost. We must also *seem* worthy of it. Our motto should be "Esse *et* videri." We must both be better and seem better than low-priced, publicly subsidized competitors if we are to succeed.

We must then help parents and students understand that there are ways to afford this difference in price--ways above and beyond the federal efforts, no matter how those efforts may benefit our students in the future. Someone once asked me how higher education could justify its "big ticket" price and yet offer so little in the way of financing options. "Where," this person asked, "would General Motors be without GMAC?"

If we are to continue to be successful, our independent, church-related institutions must educate the public on financial aid opportunities, but we must also educate them on other means of financing the cost of higher education. Payment for four years of college need not be made in four years. Eighteen years of pre-college savings opportunities exist after a child's birth; we must make information about savings plans and investment alternatives clear to families. Institutions have an opportunity to accomplish this through their alumni and in liaison with area

elementary and junior high schools. The Church can accomplish much of this same educational outreach with its membership.

For those who do not save sufficiently to afford to make the choice, we must offer a variety of financing arrangements, involving both parents and students, which will stretch payments in an affordable way for a number of years past graduation. By helping ourselves both before, during, and after enrollment, we can assure both access and a fair measure of choice for all students well into the future.

References

Brooks, Steven E. (1986). *NASFAA--the first twenty years. An organizational history of the national association of student financial aid administrators, 1966-1986.* Washington, D.C.: NASFAA.

Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976.* (3rd Ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Ford, W., Martin, A. D., and Butts, T. (1979, April 29). [Interview with Mildred McAuley]. NASFAA Oral History Project (Cassette Recording No. 4-5). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

Froelicher, J. (1982, March 17). [Interview with Mildred McAuley]. NASFAA Oral History Project (Cassette Recording No. 31). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

Gladieux, L. E. and Wolanin, T. R. (1976). *Congress and the colleges: The national politics of higher education.* Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

Hansen, J. S. and Gladieux, L. E. (1978). *Middle income students: A new target for federal aid? Tax credits and student assistance programs.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1977). *The academic revolution.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, J. L. (1980). Designing aid programs for the 1980s. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 10, 6-10.

Martin, A. D. (1980). Controls and deficiencies in the policy arena. In S. F. Binder (Ed), *Responding to change in student services.* Jossey-Bass, Publishers.

McCormick, J. L. (1972). The role of the federal government in student financial aid: a history. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 2, 47-56.

Moynihan, D. P. (1986). *Family and nation.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Rudolph, F. (1962). *The american college and university.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Tyler, Alice Felt. (1944). *Freedom's ferment.* New York: Harper and Row.

United States Congress, House and Senate. (1978). College opportunity act of 1978; Joint hearings before the senate committee on human resources and the house committee on education and labor on S. 2539. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 176 681.

Van Dusen, W. D. (1979). The coming crisis in student aid: Report of the 1978 aspen institute conference on student aid policy. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 9, 3-18.

Ward, John William. (1955). *Andrew Jackson, symbol for an age.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wood, Gordon S. (1972). *The creation of the american republic, 1776-1787.* New York: The Norton Library.

Current Challenges to the Continuation of the United Methodist Mission in Higher Education

by F. Belton Joyner, Jr.

When Dr. Norris and I first talked about my speaking here tonight, we agreed that my focus should be "Current *Challenges* to the Continuation of the United Methodist Mission in Higher Education." Thank Goodness! The topic could have been "*Solutions* to the Current Challenges to the Continuation of the United Methodist Mission in Higher Education." Most of us are better at conjuring up challenges than we are at supplying up solutions! On our good days, the challenges seem like rocks upon which to stand in order to accomplish something; on our bad days, the challenges seem like boulders of despair upon the shoulders of our possibility. Bishop L. Bevel Jones of the Charlotte Area of The United Methodist Church has described something he saw in 1984 as he drove from his native Georgia to his new home and his new work in western North Carolina. On his way to his first episcopal assignment, he saw road signs which said simply, "There is no heavier burden than a great opportunity." So the challenge in higher education is both burden and opportunity, both barrier and doorway, both the brick of walls and the brick of foundations. But as the stories unfolded in this afternoon's presentations can give witness, thus it has always been. And thus it will be, because it is of the human condition. We might say, "We with interest in higher education are undertaking no easy task, thank God!"

The context for our reflection on the role of United Methodism in higher education is, of course, The United Methodist Church. Those rich Wesleyan roots! Those noble centuries of service! Indeed, The United Methodist Church reminds of a chicken.

A chicken. You've heard why the chicken went across the road: to get to the other side. That's not the chicken about which I speak. You've heard of the chicken that went half way across the road (because she wanted to lay it on the line). No, that's not the chicken about which I speak. The chicken, which, for me, is an image of The United Methodist Church is the eastern North Carolina chicken that night after night went back and forth across the road, back and forth across the road. "Why do you do that?" she was asked. "Why do you go back and forth across the road night after night after night?" And this good Franklin County chicken said, "I go back and forth across the road to show the 'possum that it can be done!"

That's been who we are as United Methodist people: to show that it can be done! We are a doing people. It's been said "Methodists are better doing than they are at thinking." We most often define ourselves by what we have done, not by what we think. Say to a pastor, "Tell me about your church," and the answer will probably begin, "Well, we have 174 members; our budget is $41,250; we have a good day care center, but our youth program is about shot." We define ourselves by what we do, things we can count! In some sense, we know ourselves by the reports we fill out, the statistics we give. If one asks for a report on United Methodism and higher education, one is most likely to get a list of what has been accomplished, not a statement of why we do what we do. I am more likely to say, "We have 125 schools" than I am to begin, "Our mission in higher education is...." A cursory count within *The Book of Discipline* reveals about sixty-four pages of what we think and about six hundred pages of how we do things.

This observation is no call to abandon our "doingness." After all, there is some precedence for "being doers of the Word and not hearers only!" Indeed, that doingness may be God's role for United Methodism in the economy of the Church. But in understanding ourselves as primarily a "showing-that-it-can-be-done" people, we United Methodists must take care to preserve and nourish that portion of our life that sees its major gifts to be thought, to be intellect, to be reason, to be wisdom. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." (Proverbs 1:7) Reverence for God is where our task in higher education begins. To abandon our work in higher education would be to abandon God's arm reaching toward us in thought, in intellect, in reason, in wisdom. It is not wisdom that brings the fear of God, the reverence for God. It is fear of God, obedience to God, that initiates wisdom. Some traditions waltz around that and never give it its name. We who acknowledge God's claim upon us must be intentional in maintaining arenas where the name is named. And then, as did the chicken, show that it can be done: that life can be lived with meaning, that relationships can have a quality of trust, and that we can know what it is to be loved. In The United Methodist Church, we charge our institutions of higher education with the stewardship of that gift. What we are talking about tonight are challenges to that stewardship.

I see at least eight such challenges. ("Gasp!" they say. And quick minds rapidly figure that if he devotes ten minutes to each challenge, he will, alas, drone on for at least another hour and twenty minutes! That itself becomes a ninth challenge!) It is to my benefit that you know that I shall list eight challenges; in that way, you can keep time without looking at your watches...or your calendars.

The first challenge is "Why bother?" The church-related college is challenged to define the distinctiveness of church-related higher education. Why not turn education over to other willing folk? After all, the Church has a gracious plenty to do without worrying about tuitions and underfurnished chemistry labs and whether or not to schedule Oklahoma for a long fall Saturday afternoon. We have let go of

other things we started; why not this? In this conference, we don't even have a Methodist Ministers Credit Union anymore. We let go of it. What is going on in Louisburg that could not go on just as well or better with tax dollars in the next county over? If Louisburg College does not know the answer to that, if The United Methodist Church does not know the answer to that, then we fool ourselves generously.

The Church is in higher education because it is the Church. Mr. Wesley--of the Charles variety--gave clear notice of why the Methodist movement was in education when he wrote this hymn to be sung at the opening each year of the Kingswood School.

Come, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
To whom we for our children cry;
The good desired and wanted most
Out of thy richest grace supply;
The sacred discipline be given,
To train and bring them up for heaven.

Error and ignorance remove,
Their blindness both of heart and mind;
Give them the wisdom from above,
Spotless and peaceable and kind;
In knowledge pure their mind renew,
And store with thoughts divinely true.

United the pair so long disjoined,
Knowledge and vital piety;
Learning and holiness combined,
And truth and love let all folk see
In these, whom up to thee we give,
Thine, wholly thine, to die and live.

Father, accept them in thy Son,
And ever by thy Spirit guide!
Thy wisdom in their lives be shown,
Thy name confessed and glorified;
Thy power and love diffused abroad,
Till all our earth is filled with God.

Did you hear those combinations? "Heart and mind." "Knowledge and piety." "Learning and holiness." "Truth and love." There's the challenge! It's in that blending, that intentional blending, of mind and life, of open mind and obedient spirit, clear thought and doing things that matter to God--it's in that blending that

the Church stakes out a distinctive place in education. How does an institution do that? How does a college express that distinctiveness? It may be in architecture. What does your space say? (Mr. Duke knew that when he called for "a great towering church" to dominate that campus.) It may be in course requirements. What does your curriculum say? It may be in community-life standards. What do your expectations of one another say? It may be in an overwhelming willingness to be unafraid of truth. What do your choices for academic freedom teach? It may be in personnel choices. What is learned from the lives that ex-officio--by virtue of office, position, responsibility--that ex-officio represent the school? It may be in open acknowledgment of roots and support. What does it mean when trustees are elected or confirmed by the Church? It may be--and we all must join in completing the sentence, because it is in knowing the dimensions that make us distinctive that we know why we bother.

A second challenge: finding out "who's hurting?" The Church, moving in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ, always wants to know "who touched me?" Who stands next to me with a need? Where are the gaps? The church-related college seeks to identify human need that can appropriately be addressed by higher education.

That is why The United Methodist Church has set out to build a university in Zimbabwe. There, in Africa, where The United Methodist Church grows faster than anywhere else in the world, we have no higher educational presence, no way to equip persons for ministry in their native land, no way to give the gifts of farming in a region that is hungry, no way to prepare persons for employment in an area seeking the satisfaction and security of a broader based economy. The Africa University Initiative of The United Methodist Church is one way we respond to the question "who's hurting."

For the years ahead, the Church is called to know where human need is and to respond. Jesus came and touched the least, the lonely, the lost. What academic settings do we provide for educationally undernourished persons? What educational families do we offer for those who need places of safe growth? What higher education settings do we make available to those whose need is for the risk of the "real world"? How shall we respond to the unique gifts and possibilities of ethnic minority persons among us? What role do we have as Church to give the values of the faith in the midst of the most stringently rigorous academic environment?

The challenge is to identify human need that is appropriately addressed by higher education. The question is "Who's hurting?"

Why bother? Who's hurting?

Another challenge facing the church-related college is "What's happening?" That is, how do we develop patience in measuring effectiveness? We live in a world that wants quick results. It used to be that if a company wanted to offer a special

bonus, it asked the consumer to send in a coupon found in the bottom of the box. What is it now? Tear off a corner of the box and turn it in at the checkout. Instant refund. And those ubiquitous bank machines, with names like Instant Cash, Money 24, Money Now. And our good sophisticated famous families of Virginia have now instituted a lottery with the wonderful characteristic of "scratch and see." Find out immediately if you are a winner!

In a world of immediacy stands a Church following one who in himself gathered yesterday, today, and tomorrow. The Church keeps time in a different way. We are challenged to measure how well we are doing in measurements the world may not always understand. In fact, if the success of the educational program of a church-related college makes perfectly good sense to everyone else in the world, then we have probably missed our mark.

The church-related school must not judge its graduates solely on what salary I.B.M. offers when the tassel is moved. Instead, be patient: the work of the school may be measured fifteen years later when an alumnus chairs a pastor-parish committee that says, "Yes, indeed, our pastor must have freedom of the pulpit." The work of the school may be measured thirty years later when a grandchild asks, "Granddaddy, why did you go to jail when you went to Mississippi?" The work of the school may be measured thirty plus years later when an alumnus stands in front of an academic community as President and introduces another alumnus who speaks of challenges facing the church-related college in the days ahead.

What's happening? How do the schools of United Methodism decide if they are effective? Perhaps there is a clue in Lee Smith's perceptive southern novel, *Family Linen*. One of the characters is a kind of magnolia mother who is trying to find out her family history, dirty linen and all. She describes one of her kinsfolk this way: "Elizabeth, and I hate to say it, was a pure-tee fool. Now I don't mean a fool in the sense of dumb. But learning and knowing are two different things. Elizabeth learned aplenty, but she never knew much. Me, I've know more than I wanted to all my life." (Lee Smith, *Family Linen*, p. 224.)

The measurement of effectiveness may not be what people learn, but what people know--what they know about themselves, about the world, about others, about God, and about how all these merge and meld so that life makes sense, not because it is logical, but because its meaning is in a Creator who has stuck with creation. And that may not show up for awhile.

That's three challenges. For those who keep up with this kind of thing, that last one took two minutes and eighteen seconds.

Why bother? Who's hurting? What's happening? And this: "What's important?" What are the values?

In describing the work of the University Senate, the agency that approves educational institutional affiliation with The United Methodist Church, *The Book of Discipline* says that the work of the University Senate is "to support the development of institutions whose aims are to address and whose programs reflect significant educational, cultural, social, and human issues in a manner reflecting the values held in common by the institutions and the Church." (*1984 The Book of Discipline*, para. 1518.2)

Values held in common...the challenge is to establish people-sized values. The United Methodist Church struggles in a number of ways to do this. Pastoral appointments are to be made now in consultation with all parties involved. That's people-sized. Sunday School materials are to be available in such a variety that persons in every size church, in every level of experience, and in every spiritual circumstance, may find something available to help. That's people-sized. The new hymnal draws on a wider range of heritages than previous books; the new hymnal restores hymns that shaped our religious seasoning; the new hymnal introduces hymns that grow out of today's issues. That's people-sized. We do not always succeed at being people-sized. Some lines remain so sharply drawn on issues of sexual orientation so that in those matters in some measure we may be more institution-sized than people-sized.

If the campus is to be one way the Church lives out its life, then administrative decisions must increasingly be people-sized. If the church-related school be one way the Church lives among us, then the school need give worth to the individual, and find ways to say, "You have value." How can trustee and administrative and faculty styles and decisions communicate clearly that this school is here for the student, not the other way around? As we say, it's a challenge.

The fifth challenge for the continuation of the United Methodist mission in higher education is determining "what's next?" The Church always has the role of modeling the coming kingdom to the world. The church-related institution is to model to the world wholism in the midst of changing diversity. The Church, including the Church in its higher education mode, is called to live a life that shows the world how to live with differences.

Neither male, nor female! Neither Jew, nor Greek! Neither slave, nor free! Echoes of that hope are reflected in the disciplinary description of the work of higher education as "intellectual, spiritual, and material ministry to all persons within the academic community without respect to sex, race, creed, or national origin." (*1984 The Book of Discipline*, para.1513.1) What a remarkable statement! "Without respect to creed!" In that openness, The United Methodist Church says "You don't have to sign the loyalty oath to study here." Diversity is seen as a strength, not a weakness. Graduates do not all come out of the United Methodist assembly line with packaged similarity. The striving comes because it is not comfortable to live

with diversity.

I am more comfortable if folks are like I expect folks to be. A couple of years ago, the Cherokee people of western North Carolina held an annual fall festival. Many of their Native American customs were highlighted. Much of their Native American heritage was celebrated. Foods were much a part of that tradition, so there were many examples of the Native American table groaning with delight. What does that horrendous ad for Mazola say, "You call it corn; we call it maize." Bishop Jones of the Charlotte area attended the festival and quickly developed a taste for the bear meat roast which was shared as a special treat. He remarked on the rich gravy and the tender, but zangy flavor of the wild meat. "It's delicious," he said to Tom Queen, who heads up the United Methodist mission at Cherokee. "Tell me, Tom," the bishop asked, "Do you still hunt bear very often? Is that part of your tradition?" "Lord, no, Bishop," Tom Queen replied, "This bear got hit by an eighteen wheeler down on the highway. I just had a few fellows to skin it for today."

Our diversity is changing! What's next? The church should show the world how to live with those changes. Almost by definition, such changes are going to stir disagreement and generate stress on our old friend "homeostasis." Sometimes the campus is called to be the cutting edge of the upsetting of the ways things have always been. Sometimes the campus has become the final refuge of "how it was." If we be the Church, we live in that creative tension. Does the campus show the world how to disagree? In a time when "next" comes some quickly, the Church must be ready to do so.

Why bother? Who's hurting? What's happening? What's important? What's next?

And a sixth challenge: balancing institutional freedom with denominational intentionality. Let me try that another way: "Who's in charge?" The University Senate has to approve a school before it is eligible for Annual Conference funds. For five institutions within this state, the North Carolina Annual Conference participates in the election of trustees (for Louisburg, North Carolina Wesleyan, Methodist, Greensboro, and Duke). The North Carolina Annual Conference puts more money into the colleges it supports than to any other single item in the budget. If one of our colleges wants to take out a small mortgage on some of its property in order to have funds to pay off another loan at a very favorable time, the school has to have permission from the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education and Campus Ministry. University Senate? Electing trustees? Big money? Mortgage approval? Who's in charge here? (Where is Alexander Haig when we need him?) Who's in charge?

In the days ahead, the church must face with clarity the legal ties it has with its institutions. Our ministries of health and welfare concerns have been doing this in

recent times, in no small way because of the fright generated by the incident at the Pacific Homes retirement community in California. The question at stake was "If this institution belongs to the Annual Conference--and perhaps to the entire United Methodist connection--what is the fiscal and legal liability of the annual conference and of the denomination if suit is brought against the institution?" To the heart of the matter now: if someone won a suit for $75,000,000 against Louisburg College, what is the liability of the annual conference? What is the liability of The United Methodist Church? What is the liability of the Board of Trustees of Louisburg College? How much is that for each person in this room? In the days ahead, the church and the educational institutions of the church need to clarify these relationships.

Can the Annual Conference tell a college not to use a certain textbook? Can the Annual Conference require a litmus test for teaching on one of the church-related campuses? Can the Annual Conference instruct the colleges on standards for student enrollment? I think not. I think clearly not. But how does the Annual Conference become a part of the team which shapes and influences college policy and direction?

I feel a little like the fellow that Brother James McCallum once heard give a commencement address. The speaker had talked for about an hour and a half, until finally a sigh of relief went through the audience, when he said, "In conclusion, let me say..." Another sign went through the audience when he completed his statement, "In conclusion, let me say...preliminarily..."

Challenge number seven is "in conclusion, preliminarily." The question is "Who's buying?" How does the higher education ministry maintain adequate resource patterns?

It gets no easier.

My wife loaned me a book entitled, *Move Over, Mother Goose.* It is a delightful collection of verse by Ruth Dowell. It has this charming children's poem, "Alexander Salamander" (p. 52).

> Alexander Salamander,
> Sleeping on a limb,
> Dreamed there was an alligator
> Coming after him!
>
> When he got awake, he found
> No alligator there:
> Just another salamander
> Coming up for air.

That's the way it is. The bumps and blows we feel in our financial and resources strain are just another salamander, just another one of us, just another one of our good causes, just another one of our worthy needs, just another thing Jesus wants done!

The church-related college so often knows what Graham Greene means when he depicts success for a writer. "For a writer, I argued, success is always temporary, success is only a delayed failure." (Graham Green, *A Sort of Life*, p. 189) If we get one bill paid, one department renovated, one staff member added, one scholarship funded, it only lets us know that we have only moved another need to center stage. It is, as Greene says, "always temporary."

We are no strangers to facing these needs. Let's celebrate the problem; it occurs because God has chosen the way of Incarnation, the Word in our world. God is alive in a world in which faculty must be recruited, bills must be paid, and in which paint peels whether or not it is oil based. That is part of what Incarnation means, that the mission of the Church is in the world in which we live.

In the midst of resource pressures, we grapple with defining priorities. Do we buy eight new basketballs or replace the chalkboard in a classroom? In the midst of resource pressures, we contend with searches for new sources. There is always the lingering feeling that there is another Mr. Duke out there. Perhaps his name is "Louis Berg" and the school can be named after him. Or perhaps it was! In the midst of resource pressures, we wonder what would be the point of no return. My mother was a student at Methodism's Davenport College when it went out of existence. The future no doubt holds a few more Davenport Colleges.

Each church-related school must carve out its place in the student world. Some of those places are not financially rewarding. The Church must be sensitive to the school that will place itself in jeopardy, not because of sloppy administration, but because of stretching to meet needs. Hans Kueng has written, "...in light of the person of Jesus education can never be for the sake of my own prestige, repute, interest, but for the sake of the one who is entrusted to me." (Hans Kueng, *On Being A Christian*, p. 599) Surely the church will hold itself accountable for those entrusted to it.

One more...and maybe the toughest and maybe the easiest. The mission of the Church in higher education is the same mission as the Church has in all settings: to be a presence of Jesus Christ. The challenge, this eighth challenge, is inviting persons into a relationship with Jesus Christ. The question might be stated, "Who's responding?"

Here we are hardly talking about altar calls at the end of every political science lecture--although during these days of electioneering, that may not be a bad

idea! We are not speaking of Francis Asbury look-alikes or John Wesley think-alikes or Carrie Nation do-alikes. But what is the responsibility for naming the Name? What is the foolishness of the Cross in the academic setting?

Chaim Potok opens his novel *The Chosen* with the observation by Reuven, his main character, that "For the first fifteen years of our lives, Danny and I lived within five blocks of each other and neither of us knew of the other's existence." (Chaim Potok, *The Chosen*, p. 9) The conviction of our community of faith is that Jesus Christ knows of our existence, but that there is the dreadful possibility that one might live within five blocks of the Christ for the years of college, and never know of his existence. A basic question for church-related higher education is how to offer that introduction.

Maybe it is enough to help someone become more nearly fully human. Maybe it is enough to help someone develop as a whole person. Maybe it is enough to help fill in the gap--physical, mental, spiritual--that may be in someone's life. Maybe it is enough to help someone become service oriented. Maybe it is enough to be there. Maybe.

Perhaps our first challenge and our closing challenge have come full circle and have met. "Why bother?" we asked as we started. What is distinctive about church-related higher education? "Who's responding?" we have asked as we close. How does a church-related community of higher education invite persons into a relationship with Jesus Christ?

I did mention, didn't I, that these were challenges?

Commentary on The United Methodist Mission in Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospects

by Walter N. McDonald

In this commentary I shall first respond to those things which pertain to the "retrospect" facets of the program and then make some remarks pertaining to "prospects" as these prospects may be ascertained from the former.

Retrospect

I find Dr. Ricketts' very concise review of the reasons for the establishment of church-related colleges in the nineteenth century very intriguing in the light of what is presented by the church today as reasons for church support of higher education. In the ten motives from Dr. Albea Godbold's study, as quoted by Dr. Ricketts, six may be categorized as being for institutional reasons, three for the benefit of the individual student, and one as being sectional in nature. (Note that one of the motives, namely evangelism, is both individual and institutional.)

This compares rather interestingly with a set of reasons given for the support of Methodist Student Day in the churches. (Methodist Student Day is an occasion when funds for scholarships and loans are received through Methodist churches.) Five reasons are given: (1) to help students who have financial problems; (2) to help students who wish to serve their communities; (3) to help people improve their self-images by exerting a positive influence upon their lives; (4) to build a loyalty to the church; (5) to help train ministers for the church.

It can rather quickly be seen that two of these reasons are personal, two are institutional, and one is community oriented. Those reasons of a personal nature have a closer relationship to personal status than did the personal motives of Dr. Godbold's list. It should be noted that evangelism is not mentioned because the recipients of Methodist Student Day are limited to Methodist students.

Throughout Dr. Willard's paper, which concentrated on Louisburg College, these same factors are to be noted. Louisburg College promoted itself as being inexpensive, it was a school in which "the elevation of women" was considered to be "inseparably intertwined with the social and moral progress of the nation," the college was always publicized as having a strong relationship with the Methodist

Church, and it was "to encourage and promote the educational interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South" that Mr. B. N. Duke transferred the college to the church.

In Dr. Brooks' paper is indicated a significant adaptation in at least one of the motives for maintaining church colleges, that of access. Whereas in the past century church sponsored education was less expensive than other types, including state sponsored, today it is more expensive. In the paper is described the ways in which church colleges have utilized both state and federal funds in order to bridge the gap and to stay in operation. Thus have church colleges been able to remain competitive and, also, to provide access for non-affluent students.

Dr. Brooks has alluded to some of the risks of church colleges becoming "tax dependent" as the public has begun to resist taxation in general and the necessity for educational choice in particular. I would like to suggest two additional problems which may be detrimental to the church college.

First, there is the risk that interpretations of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution may become so narrowly construed to the point that *any* federal or state monies directed in *any* manner to a church-related college may be declared unconstitutional. In such a situation, without some drastic funding changes, church colleges will become institutions for the elite.

Second, for transfer-oriented institutions like Louisburg College, since the vast majority of their students transfer to the state universities, there is the strong risk, and even the prospect, that church college programs and curricula be patterned after them. In such a situation, these colleges would lose their identities and their reasons for being.

Prospects

In the light of the foregoing discussion of church colleges in retrospect, let us now look at the prospects.

Let me begin by stating that I have not read Dr. Joyner's paper; however, I have seen his "bare-boned" outline. It is possible that I may repeat some of the things which he has already said, but I can assure you that they will not be said in his inimitable style.

It has become very clear that some alternative ways of financing church-related education is in the offing. I cannot suggest any possibilities beyond those already proposed by Dr. Brooks. However, to ask people to save up for expensive (to the purchaser) education when less of his own out-of-pocket money is required for

other types, requires that the church college provide an education beyond that available in secular colleges.

I would like to submit two proposals by which the prospects for church colleges may be improved.

First, that the church and the church college get a clear understanding of the mission of the church college. Such a mission should include relating the traditional Christian values of love of God and love of man to its educational program; educating students not only for work and professions but also to be of service to God, country, and humanity; recognizing that the church college and its staff are instruments of the church as the church and its members seek "to serve as Christ served and to heal as He healed."

Second, in the words of Dr. Brooks, the church college should take a stance of both "esse" and "videri," *to be* and *to seem*. It cannot pay lip service to its mission. On the contrary, its mission must be understood, accepted, and applied by all its constituencies. Having done so, it must present itself as a college with a great mission, a greater view of human potential, and a greater hope for its students.